THE BUDDHIST SECTS

OF THE

LESSER VEHICLE

By

André Bareau

1955

(Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule)

Translated from the French by
Gelongma Migme Chodron
2005

Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule

by André Bareau (1955)

PART I

GENERALITIES

INTRODUCTION

From the first centuries of its history, the Buddhist Community split into numerous *sects* and *schools* on the occasion of sometimes sensational schisms, and each of these divisions held opinions that were accused of being *heresies* by the others. The present work is concerned with these schools, these schisms and these heresies.

Before getting into the thick of the subject, it is important to clarify the meaning of the above terms which we are using for lack of any better ones, but which do not exactly express the Indian notions that they claim to represent.

We will call *sect* or *school* what Sanskrit Buddhism calls *nikāya* and Pāli Buddhism calls *ācariyavāda*. A *nikāy*a is a group of people subject to the same rules. More generally, it is also a collection of objects, such as the collections of Sūtras called *nikāya* in Pāli. By comparing the word *kāya*, which has the same root and means *body*, we may say that a *nikāya* is a constituted *body* or a *body* of doctrine according to whether the word is applied to people or to things. Thus it renders rather well the word 'sects' although constructed on quite a different etymology. The Pāli word *ācariyavāda* means oral teaching (*vāda*) of a master (*ācariya*) and, rather, corresponds to our word 'school'. As the Sanskrit texts call *nikāya* what the Pāli texts call *ācariyavāda*, we will use the words *sect* and *school* in the same sense. They express the idea of a spiritual association constituted under the patronage of a master whose teaching it follows.

Buddhist sects differ from those of early Christianity in that the sect or school, not having a supreme incarnate authority like the Christian church, did not really separate itself from the Community and that its *heresy* was purely relative to the doctrine of the other factions of the latter. In most cases, the relationships between various sects was not without peace and harmony and the Buddhist sects could be compared to the Protestant sects which, while greatly differing sometimes in regard to doctrine or practice, are nonetheless united in a certain way at the ecumenical level.

We will call 'schism' what the Buddhists call *saṇghabheda*, "splitting of the Community", which constitutes one of the five major crimes, comparable in gravity to that of parricide, matricide, murder of an Arhat and wounding of a Buddha. It occurs when an intelligent and virtuous monk <8> who, consequently, enjoys great authority carries away with himself a part of the Community and gives it a new teacher and a new Path.[1] But once again, since the Community lacks a supreme authority, the Buddhist schism is purely relative and the schismatic claims to be the guardian of the doctrinal or moral purity, weakened by the decadence of the Community from which it has originated and of which he presents himself to be the reformer.

[1] L.V.P.: Kośa, IV, p. 208-209.

We will call *heresy* what the Buddhists call *dṛṣṭi* (Pāli *diṭṭhi*), 'view', personal opinion not conforming to the teaching of the Buddha. It is called *mithyādṛṣṭi* 'wrong view' as opposed to *samyagdṛṣṭi*, 'right view'. These terms usually have only relative value, what is heresy or wrong view for one sect being right view for another.

Of the some twenty or thirty Hīnayāna sects or schools, we have, barely, the works of the Theravādins and Sarvāstivādins plus some works, especially of the Vinaya, of the Dhrmaguptakas, Mahīśasakas, Mahāsāṇghikas, Lokottaravādins, Mūlasarvāstivādins, Sammatīyas, Kāśyapīyas, Haimatvatas, Abhayagirivāsins, Bahuśrutīyas or Prajñaptivādins. Fortunately there are collections of theses classified according to sects, collections of controversies, some commentaries, and a rather large amount of information scattered throughout several treatises such as the *Vibhāṣā* or the *Abhidharmakośa*. The comparative and critical study of all these documents, of such varied origins, has turned out to be much less disappointing than was generally thought on the evidence of old summarizing works sometimes poorly prepared. It transpires that some pessimistic conclusions, being based on poor readings of the texts, on the use of faulty editions, or quite simply on grave errors of method too often committed as such, which consist of putting documents of very differing ages and values on the same level and then coming to a conclusion after superficial examination, the contradictions existing among them make them completely unusable. The worst is that these errors are long-lived, that some have been piously conserved for over a century and used, without a shadow of verification, often by eminent researchers.

Without a doubt, the value and accuracy of the documents used and the conclusions, all provisional, that can be drawn from their study, should not be exaggerated. The study of Indian Buddhism requires a great deal of care and it can be stated almost without reserve that in this domain historical certainty does not exist, that there are only lesser or greater probabilities. This is even more true in that, despite the magnificent efforts accomplished during more than a century, there still remains so much to be discovered in the vast jungle of documents that has come down to us, without counting those, certainly even more numerous, alas, that have disappeared without leaving any trace. Here rather than anywhere else, it is appropriate to remember constantly that our data are fragile, uncertain, that they require always an interpretation from which it is difficult and without a doubt even impossible to remove the proportion due to the 'personal equation', that of the reader and that of the author, no matter the integrity and the experience of either.

The object of the present work has been first and foremost to furnish documents <9> and references. In its original form, it was but a series of notes incorporated into the French translation of treatises by Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva. The general parts and the various hypotheses that have been drawn from the direct study of the documents thus collected are none other than simple propositions, simple theses, accompanying antitheses, and not definitive conclusions. They have no other goal than to present new aspects of old problems and to ask new questions. <15>

CHAPTER I

The existence and the genealogy of the Buddhist sects of the Foundational Vehicle

The traditions relative to the sects, more or less detailed genealogical charts or simple lists, have been preserved for us in numerous works. For a long time attempts have been made to reconstitute from them the history of the schisms that have divided the Buddhist Community of the Foundational Vehicle, the Hīnayāna or Lesser Vehicle. Unfortunately, at first sight, these various traditions are far from agreement. Moreover, most of these documents have come down to us through their Chinese or Tibetan versions, the translation and interpretation of which have often been difficult and have caused numerous errors. With unjustified piety, most of them have been preserved for almost a century, serving as basis for rash hypotheses and increasing the confusion that seems to characterize the problem of the lists.

A systematic study of the traditions, based on these very documents, without worrying about the best justified translations, permits this problem to be resolved with a satisfactory degree of probability.

It is important first of all to establish the very existence of these sects for, due to the confusion that surrounds the question, some philologists, erring through excessive caution, put it into doubt. But the existence of most of the sects is proved by means of sound documents:[2]

1) *Inscriptions*: sects of the Mahāsāṇghika, Bahuśrutīya, Caitika, Aparaśaila, Pūrvaśaila, Rājagirika, Siddhārthika, Sarvāstivādin, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, Vātsīputrīya, Sammatīya, Dharmottarīya, Bhadrayānīya.

2) *Literary works*: representatives of the sects of the Theravādin, Sarvāstivādin, Mahāsānghika, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Haimavata, Sammatīya, Lokottavādin, Mūlasravāstivādin.

There are thus nineteen sects in all, the existence of which is certified by indisputable documents. There remain only six whose existence is not thus proven: the Gokulika, Ekavyāvahārika, Prajñaptivādin, Sautrāntika (or Saṇkrāntika), Tāmraśātiya and Saṇṇagarika. But it seems that chance alone has not allowed traces of their existence to be kept and there is no reason to doubt their existence. Besides, the Sautrāntikas are too well known to permit any doubt in their regard as to their reality, and it seems indeed that the Lokottaravādins were all or part of the Ekavyāvahārikas as we will see. <16>

As a result, the existence of the twenty to thirty sects of which the traditions speak cannot be put into doubt.

The works which have transmitted to us the charts and lists of sects are not very old. None date with any certainty before 300 years C.E., i.e., some 500 years after the events which they report. But we have the good luck of possessing, among these old texts, those of which the geographical and sectarian origins were the most distant, Kashmir and Ceylon, the Mahāsāṇghikas and the Theravādins.

[2] For references, see Part II.

The classification of these documents requires that three chronological groups be distinguished.

I. THE TRADITIONS OF THE FIRST PERIOD

They are previous to the 6th century of our era and are characterized by a division of the sects into two main groups. They must be classified according to their geographic origin.

A. THE SINGHALESE TRADITION

It was given for the first time by the *Dīpavaṃsa*[3] which dates from the 4th century of our era and is of Theravādin inspiration. According to this work, all the schisms occurred in the course of the 2nd century after the Nirvāṇa.

Ekalyohārika (*sic*)
Gokulika — Paññattivāda
Mahāsāṇghika — Bahussutika
Cetiya
Dhammuttariya
Bhadrayanika
Vajjiputtaka — Channagarika
Samitiya
Dhammaguttika
Sabbatthivāda
Theravāda
Mahiṃsāsaka — Kassapika
Saṇkantika
Suttavāda

In the introduction to his commentary on the *Kathāvatthu*, in the following century, Buddhaghosa mentions the existence of six new sects: the Rājagirikas, the Siddhatthikas, the Pubbaseliyas, the Aparadeliyas, the Haimavatas and the Vājjiriyas. He groups the first four under the title of Andhaka. The inscriptions actually mention their presence only in tha land of Andhra, around Amarāvatī. In the same work, Buddhaghosa attributes several theses of the Kathāvatthu to some sects or groups of sects which he does not define: the Uttarāpaṭhakas, Hetuvādas and Vetullakas.

We know nothing of the Vājiriyas. Under the name of Uttarāpaṭhaka, Buddhaghosa designates the sects of northern location, but he does not define them more explicitly. <17> A tradition brought in by Bhavya (list

[3] Dīpavaṃsa, V, beginning. Mahāvaṃsa, V, beginning.

1) identifies the Hetuvādins as Sarvāstivādins, but Buddhaghosa clearly distinguishes these two sects. He attributes to the Vetullakas some markedly Mahāyānist opinions.

B. THE TRADITION OF THE SAMMATÈYAS

It is given to us by Bhavya (list 3). It dates the first schism at 137 E.N. (era of the Nirvāṇa), the second at 200 E.N, the third at 400 E.N.

		Ekavyāvahārika			
			Bahuśrutiya		
Mahāsḥaṇgjhika	Gokulika	Prajñapativādin			
			Caitika		
					Mahīśāsaka
				Vibhajavādin	Dharmaguptaka
			Sarvāstivādin		Tāmraśātiya
					Kāśypīya
		Mūlasthavira		Saṇkrāntivādin	
Sthavira				Dharmmottara	
			Vātsīputriya	Mahāgirika	Bhadrayānīya
					Saṇṇagarika
				Sammitīya	
		Haimavata			

C. THE KASHMIRIAN TRADITION

It is represented by several works.

1) The *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*[4] is a work of Mahāsāṇghika origin but which fits well into the Kashmirian tradition, as is proved by comparison with the following. The dates of appearance of the different sects are given in parentheses. Translated into Chinese between 317 and 420, it is dated therefore later than the beginning of the 4th century.

	(2nd cent. E.N.)	Ekavyāvahārika
	"	Lokottaravādin
	"	Kukkula
	"	Bahuśrutaka
Mahāsāṇghika (2nd century E.N.)	Prajñaptivādin	
	----------(3rd cent. E.N.)	Mahādeva
	"	Caitra
	"	Matarīya
		Dharmopeka
		Bhadrayānika
	(3rd cent. E.N.) Vātsīputrīya	Sammatīya
		Saṇṇagarika

[4] T.S., 1465, p. 900bc (T.S.: Taisho Issaikyo edition).

Sthavira Mahīśāsaka
" Sarvāstivādin Dharmaguptaka
Suvarṣaka
Kāśyapīya
Sūtravādin
(4th cent. E.N.) Sāṇkrāntika. <18>

2) The *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*: by Vasumitra. There is one Tibetan translation and three Chinese translations of which the oldest dates about 400. It is certainly of Sarvāstivādin origin.

(2nd cent. E.N.) Ekavyāvahārika
" Lokottaravādin
" Kukkuṭika
(100 E.N.) Mahāsānghika ----------Bahuśrutīya
Prajñaptivādin
Caitika
Aparaśaila (= Pâurvaśaila)
Uttaraśaila
(3rd cent. E.N.) Haimavata
(3rd cent. E.N.) Dharmottariya
(3rd cent. E.N.) " Bhadrayānīya
Vātsīputrīya " Sammatīya
- Saṇṇagarika
(100 E.N.) (3rd cent. E.N) (3rd cent. E.N.) Mahīśaāsaka
Sthavira Sarvāstivādin (3rd cent.E.N.) Dharmaguptaka
(3rd cent. E.N.) Suvarṣaka (= Kāśyapīya)
(4th cent. E.N.) Sautrāntika (= Saṇkrāntika, Uttarīya)

If this list is compared with the three preceding lists, we may immediately notice that it is related directly with the last, that of the *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*. Indeed,

a) the dates of the appearance of the sets is the same;
b) the order of the first five sects of the Mahāsāṇghikas and that of the four sects of the Vatsīptrīyas are the same in both cases.

The differences are much more noticeable with the other two lists. But even between the two Kashmirian lists, there are differences:

a) the last three Mahāsāṇghika sects do not have the same names; those given by the Sūtra are even unknown elsewhere; they are possibly little used synonyms;
b) the Sūtra ignores the Haimavatas, like the Ceylonese *Dīpavaṃsa*; this sect poses a problem to which we will return later;
c) the Sūtra distinguishes the Sūtravādins of the Sāṇkrāntikas and the Kāśyapīyas of the Suvarṣakas whereas Vasumitra identifies them; it seems that the latter is right;

d) Vasumitra, who was a Sarvāstivādin, tended to give his sect an importance greater than it possessed; contrary to the other three lists, he derived all the Sthavira sects, with the sole exception of the Haimavatas, from the Sarvāstivādins; it is evident that this feature is a falsification of the Sarvāstivādin origin and should not be considered as having any historical value.

Thus we have just reconstituted the shared Kashmirian list (the dates, on which they are in agreement, are omitted): <19>

Ekavyāvahārika
Lokottaravādin
Kukkuṭika
Bahuśrutīya
Mahāsāṇghika — Prajñaptivādin
Caitika (= Caitra)
Purvaśaila (= Mahādeva ?)
Uttaraśaila (= Matarīya ?)
Dharmottarīya
Bhadrayānīya
Vātsīputrīya — Sammitīya
Saṇṇagarika
Sthavira — Mahīśāsaka
Sarvāstivādin — Dharmaguptaka
Kāśyapīya
Sautrāntika

3) The *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra*[5]: according to this work, all the schisms took place in the 1st century E.N. The sects are all derived linearily one from the other:

Mahāsāṇghika — Sthavira
Ekavyāvahārika — Sarvāstivādin
Lokottaravādin — Haimavata
Kaukullika — Vātsīputrīya
Bahuśrutīya — Dharmottarīya
Caitika — Bhadrayānika
Pūrvaśaila — Sammitīya
Uttaraśaila — Saṇḍagairika
Mahīśāsaka
Dharmaguptaka
Kāśyapīya
Sautrāntika

[5] T.S. 468, p. 501ab.

This list is clearly just a faulty reading of the chart given by Vasumitra in which all the secondary linkages have been suppressed and the sects of the Prajñaptivādins has been omitted in order to come up with the traditional number of 18 sects. The Sūtra, translated into Chinese in 518 by Saṇghavara, is dated later than the beginning of the 5th century. It is later than the treatise of Vasumitra by which it was inspired. It gives a simple list and not a chart, which characterizes an era already more recent. The translation of the terms of this list has given rise to several errors, for <20> it is based on the Chinese *Mahāvyutpatti.*[6] Chapter CCLXXIV of the latter, dedicated to the names of the sects, has several interpretations which are wrong, as Prof. Anesaki has pointed out in his edition of this work where he notes them by the signal: (!). It is high time to go further and correct these errors: [p. 20F is omitted – Chinese characters]

4) *Bhavya's first list*: Although Tāranātha, who reproduces it, attributes it to the Sthaviras, it is of Kashmirian and Sarvāstivādin origin. <21> Like the preceding one, it is a poor reading of Vasumitra's chart, transformed into a list. The related tradition dates the first schism at 160 E.N., but this date is more than suspect for reasons that we will go into elsewhere.

Mahāsāṇghika	Sthavira (= Haimvata)
Ekavyāvahārika	Sarvāstivādin (= Vibhajyavādin, Hetuvādin, Muruṇṭaka
Lokottaravādin	Vātsīputrīya
Bahuśrutīya`	Dhamottarīya
Prajñaptivādin	Bhadrayānīya
Caitika	Sammitīya (= Avantaka, Kurukula)
Pūrvaśaila	Mahīśāsaka
Aparaśaila	Dharmaguptaka
	Dharmasuvarṣaka (= Kāśyapīya)
	Uttarīyas (= Saṇkrāntivādin)

a) the Kukkuṭikas have been omitted, but the Prajñāptivādins appear term has been omitted in order to obtain the total of 18 sects, but the choice is different;

b) the Saññagarikas are missing in the 2nd column and the Haimavatas are identified with the Sthaviras, which allows the obtaining of 18 sects. It is easy to reconstitute the list from which both this and the preceding one are derived:

Mahāsāngika	Sthavira
Ekavyāvāhārika	Haimavata
Lokottaravādin	Sarvāstivādin
Kukkuṭika	Vātsīpurīya
Bahuśrutīya	Dharmottarīya
Prajñaptivādin	Bhadrayānīya
Caitika	Sammatīya
Pūrvaśaila	Saññagarika

[6] The errors seem to come from S. Julien: *Various lists of the eighteen schismatic schools that have come from Buddhism*, J.A. vol. XIV, 1859, p. 327-361, the first part of which is a re-editing of that of the *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra*. It will be seen that Przyluski himself did not rectify it.

Aparaśaila (= Uttaraśaila)	Mahīśasaka
	Dharmaguptaka
	Kāśyapīya (= Suvarsaka)
	Sautrāntika (= Uttarīya, Sāṇkrāntivādin)

This is just the listing of the names given in the chart by Vasumitra. Chronologically, this shared list is later to the chart, but earlier than the 3rd and 4th Kashmirian lists derived from it. Basing oneself on the dates of the Chinese translations, we have:

1) Chart of the *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*, about 300
2) Chart of Vasumitra, about 350
3) List of Chart of Vasumitra, about 400
4) List of *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchasūtra* about 450
5) List no. 1 of Bhavya about 450 <22>

5) The list of the five sects of *Uḍḍiyāna*: The Chinese historians of Buddhism have kept the memory of a classification into five sects, these five sects sometimes being given as the five trunks of the eighteen sects.[7] In addition, the fact that, in India, this classification is known only in works of this area, the latter give a satisfactory explanation of it. After giving the chart of the sects, the *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra,* translated between 317 and 420,[8] states that at the era when it was edited there remained no more than five sects, namely the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Dharmaguptakas, the Sarvāstivādins, the Kāśyapīyas and the Mahīśāsakas. We know from unimpeachable evidence (inscriptions, Pāli literature, stories of the voyages of Hiuan-tsang and I-tsing) that indeed other sects were still prospering at that time, but outside of Uddiyāna, which explains the error of the Sūtra on this point. It was in Uddiyāna that Hiuan-tsang met the last survivors of this group of five sects[9] who were studying their five *Vinayapiṭakas*, but who had fallen back into their bad old ways of magic. More than a century later, I-tsing mentions them again the same region.[10] Another Indian work, translated at about the same time as the Sūtra[11] gives a description of five sects almost the same as the latter, but places the Sarvāstivādins first, which seems to mean that its author belonged to this sect. It is noteworthy in this description that these two works give equal praise to the five sects. This seems to indicate that these lived in perfect harmony in Uddiyāna. In any case, neither of these two documents claims that these five sects were the five original sects nor does it make them belong to a classification of the eighteen sects. To the contrary, one of the two, probably the older, explains clearly that they represented, at the time when it was written, all that remained (at least in his area) of the eighteen sects. Indeed, there is no Indian document that justifies the Chinese classification based on these five sects. We must, therefore, consider these as quite wrong, the more so in that they are contradicted by all the other classifications of the eighteen sects that we are studying here more precisely.

---

[7] See Chavannes: *Mémoire sur les religieux Éminents*, 1894, p. 131, note, which cites texts and attempts to interpret them, and more recently, Lin-Li Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, p. 193-4.
[8] T.S. 1465, p. 900c.
[9] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels in India*, 1904, vol. I, p. 226-7.
[10] Takakusu, *A record of the buddhist religion*, 1896, p. xxiv.
[11] T.S. 1470, p. 925c-926a.

II. THE TRADITIONS OF THE SECOND ERA

They date from the 6th and 7th century and are characterized by their division of the sects into three of four main groups.

A. THE TRADITION OF THE MAHĀṆGHIKAS

It is the second list of Bhavya. Tāranātha attributes it to the Mahāsāṇghikas, which is possible as it differs from all those we have seen previously. This is a classification into three main groups, which may place it chronologically between the last Kashmirian lists of the 5th century and the Mūlasarvāstivādin lists of the 7th century, and therefore in the 6th century. <23>

	Sarvāstivādin	
	Sarvāstivādin	Sautrāntika
Sthavira		Sammatīya
		Dharmottarīa
	Vātsīputrīya	Bhadrayānīya
	Saṇṇagarika	
	Mahāsāṇghika	
	Pūrvaśaila	
	Aparaśaila	
Mahāsāṇghika	Rājagirika	
	Haimavata	
	Caitika	
	Siddhārthika	
	Gokulika	
	Mahīśāsika	
	Kāśyapīya	
Vibhajyavādin	Dharnmaguptaka	
	Tāmraśātīya	

We notice that:

a) the Vibhājyavādins form a separate group, quite distinct from the Sarvāstivādins; this indicates a southern origin, because the Sarvāstivādins were absent in the south in contrast to the Vibhajyavādins; moreover, the fact that memory of relationships between the two groups had been lost indicates a rather late date;

b) the Vātsīputrīyas came directly from the Sthaviras and not, as Vasumitra maintains, from the Sarvāstivādins;

c) the order of the four Vātsīputrīya sects is new; notably, the Sammatīyas are first which undoubtedly is not unconnected with the important place they occupied towards the beginning of the 7th century as reported by Hiuan-tsang and I-tsing;

d) the large sects of the Mahāsāṇghikas, except for the Gokulikas, have disappeared; on the other hand, the four Andhaka sects of Buddhaghosa are named, which seems to indicate a southern origin;

e) the Haimavatas are placed among the Mahāsāṇghikas, in contrast to the preceding lists which place them among the Sthaviras, but in agreement with Vinitideva;

f) the Tāmraśātiyas are named as in the chart of the Sammatīyas given above; perhaps a geographical indication should be seen here, the Andhra land being very close to Mahārāṣṭra and Mālva, the main domains of the Sammatīyas and related to them.

This tradition is of distinctly southern origin. If Tāranātha is correct, it took its course among the Mahāsāṇghikas of the South, i.e., the land of Andhra around Amarāvatī. This is all the more plausible in that it is completely different from the other two southern traditions, those of the Theravādins of Ceylon and the Sammatīyas of the west. Thus it has great documentary value. On the other hand, it belongs to a rather late era. By reflecting the state of the sects of that period, probably the 6th century, it provides an appreciable milestone in the chronological scale of our information. <24>

It has been transmitted to us, for the end of the 7th century, by I-tsing, but in an incomplete form and for the 8th century by Vinitadeva. It consists of four main groups.

1.The list of I-tsing[12]

1) Arya-Mahāsāṇghika, 7 subdivisions, not specified.

2) Arya-Sthavira: 3 subdivisions, not specified.

3) Arya-Mūlasarvāstivādin: 4 subdivisions

- *a)* Mūlasarvāstivādin
- *b)* Dharmaguptaka
- *c)* Mahīśāsaka
- *d)* Kāśyapīya

4) Arya-Sammatīya: 4 subdivisions, not specified.

It is possible to reconstitute it partially with the help of Vinītadeva's list:

	Mahāsaṇghika ?
	Lokottaravādin ?
	Bahuśritīya
1) Arya-Mahāsāṇghika	Prajñaptivādin ? *with the greatest of reservations*
	Haimavata ?
	Pūrvaśaila ?
	Aparaśaila ?
	Jetavanīya

[12] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. xxiii-xxiv and 7-20.

2) Arya-Sthavira	Abhayagirivādin *very probable*
	Mahāvihāravāsin
	Mūlasarvāstivādin
	Dharmaguptaka
3) Arya-Mūlasarvāstivādin	Mahīśāsaka
	Kāśyapīya
	Sammatīya (or Vātsīputrīya)
	Dharmottarīya
4) Arya-Sammatīya	Bhadayānīya *probable*
	Saññagarika

2. *The list of Vinītadeva*

It differs noticeably from the preceding and contains some important errors.

	Pūrvaśaila
	Aparaśaila
Mahāsāṇghika	Haimavata
	Lokottaravādin
	Prajñaptivādin
	Mūlasarvāstivādin
	Kāśyapīya
	Mahīśāsaka
Sarvāstivādin	Dharmaguptaka
	Bahuśrutīya
	Tāmraśātiya
	Vibhajyavādin <25>
	Jetavanīya
Sthavira	Abhayagirivāsin
	Mahāvihāravāsin
	Kaurukullaka ?
Sammatīya	Avantaka ?
	Vātsīputrīya

In this list, we may note:

a) the Haimavatas are placed among the Mahāsāṇghikas, as in the Mahāsāṇghika list above;

b) the Mahāsāṇghika sects of the North and of the South seem to be poorly known also, either that they had disappeared by this time, which is probable, or that the list had been elaborated in a region distant from both Kashmir and the land of Andhra, for instance at Magadha or Madhyadeśa where, according to I-tsing, the Mūlasarvāstivādins were then the most numerous (there is no doubt that the list of I-tsing derives from this area);

c) the Mahīśasakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, Tāmraśātīyas and Vibhajyavādins are placed among the Sarvāstivādins, which is an index of Sarvāstivādin origin;

d) the Bahuśrutīyas are also placed among the Sarvāstivādins not among the Mahāsāṇghikas, as in the earliest lists; we may recall that Vasumitra noted the doctrinal relationship between the Bahuśrutīyas and the Sarvāstivādins;

e) Vibhajyavādin sects appears for the first time, distinct from but related to the Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Kāśyapīya and Tāmraśātīyas, which poses a problem;

f) the three Ceylonese Sthavira sects are named; this proves that the geographical origin of this list was in relationship with Ceylon and reinforces the hypothesis of Magadhian origin;

g) the Sammatīyas have eclipsed all the related sects and become first in line; in the second quarter of the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang already had noted their great importance numerically;

h) the three small Vātsīputrīya sects, the Dharmottarīyas, the Bhadrayānīyas and the Saṇṇagarikas, have disappeared.

III. THE TRADITIONS OF THE THIRD ERA

These are more or less altered re-editions of the early lists.

A.THE CHINESE LISTS

They are given particularly by the *San louen yi Kiuan* translated by Stanilaus Julien[13] and are not faithful copies of the charts and lists of the Kashmirian tradition of the first era. The only notable differences come from errors of translation by S. Julien. There is no use to repeat them here. <26>

B. THE TIBETAN LISTS OF TĀRANĀTHA

These are rather faithful copies of the three lists of Bhvaya and that of Vinītadeva. The biggest mistakes come from errors in the reading of Schiefner: it is not the Tibetan text that is wrong, it is the German translation.

In his copy of list number 1 of Bhavya, which he attributes to the Sthaviras, Tāranātha omits only citation of the synonyms given by Bhvavya.

His copy of list number 2 of Bhavya, which he attributes to the Mahāsāṇghikas, is entirely correct. Schiefner is wrong in translating *don-grup-pa*, which means Siddhārthika, as Saṃkrānti.

Tāranātha copies chart number 3 of Bhavya, which he attributes correctly to the Sammatīyas, by transforming it into a simple list of four groups: Sarvāstivādin, Vātsīputrīya, Haimavata and Mahāsāṇghika. Schiefner is wrong in translating *man-ston-pa*, which means Mahāśāsaka, as Bahuśrutīya, in the first group.

The copy of the list of Vinītadeva is completely correct.

C. OTHER TIBETAN LISTS

They are all linked to the Mūlasarvāstivādin traditions of the second era. They are more recent by several centuries but always consist of the same four groups as these: Sarvāstivādin or Mūlasarvāstivādin,

[13] *Listes diverses des dix-huit Écoles schismatiques qui sont sorties du Bouddhisme*.

Mahāsāṇghika, Sammatīya and Sthavira. In general, like I-tsing, they are content to give the number of subdivisions of each group without specifying the composition, and these numbers are rather variable.
The *Varṣāgrapṛcchāsūtra,*[14] translated in the 11th century, gives*:*

	Kāśyapīya
	Mahīśāsaka
Arya-Sarvāstivādin	Dharmaguptaka
	Mūlasarvāstivādin
	Pūrvaśaila
	Aparaśaila
Arya-Mahāsāṇghikaṣ	Haimavata
	Vibhajyavādin
	Prajñaptivādin
	Lokottaravādin
	Tāmraśātīya
	Avantaka
Arya-Sammatīya	Kurukulla
	Bahuśrutīya
	Vātsīputrīya
	Jetavanīya
Arya-Sthavira	Abhayagirivāsin
	Mahāvihāravāsin

We may note that: <27>

a) the Sarvāstivādin group is that of I-tsing, although the order is changed, and it is in agreement with the oldest lists;
b) the Mahāsāṇghika group is identical with that of Vinītadeva, which is correct, but the Vibhajyavādins have been incorporated for some obscure reason; this is certainly a mistake;
c) the incorporation of the Tāmraśātīyas and the Bahuśrutīyas into the Sammatīya group is clearly an error; apart from that, this group is the same as that of Vinītadeva;
d) the Sthavira group is the same as that of Vinītadeva.

In summary, all the lists of the third period are more or less correct copies of the lists of the two preceding eras and there is nothing in them unknown to the older documents.

As might be expected, the traditions diverge more amongst themselves the more recent they are. Comparison of the three great traditions of the first era should allow the reconstitution of a chart of the sects that reflects the true history quite well.

The objection will be made that this effort is futile, that we have only traditions and not trustworthy documents. This argument is of little value because:

a) we have shown that the existence of the quasi-totality of the sects is a definite fact;

[14] *Mdo*, LXXIV, 2; XCV, 16; XC, 2, 6 and 21. Rockhill: *Life of the Buddha*, 1884, p. 183.

b) the five traditions that have come down to us have their origin in places the most distant from one another in India, Kashmir, Ceylon, the West, Andhra and Magadha, which makes difficult the acceptance of a shared tradition by all these regions;

c) these traditions differ in characteristic details proving that they are not all derived from the same shared tradition.

Consequently, we find ourselves in the presence of independent traditions, each sect having kept the memory of the schisms that shook the Buddhist Community and especially of the one that gave birth to it. Each of these traditions represents the history of these schisms seen from a particular point of view, the cause of definite errors.

Let us now compare the three traditions of the first era, group by group.

I. *The Mahāsāṇghikas*

1) The three traditions agree in first making two large sects emerge: the *Ekavyāvahārikas* and the *Gokulikas* or *Kukkuṭikas*.
2) Only the tradition of the North knew the *Lokottaravādins*. The only information we have on their residence comes from Hiuan-tsang who places them at Bamiyān in northern Afghanistan, which explains why the southern traditions were unaware of them. On the other hand, the tradition of the Sammitīyas attributes to the Ekavyāvahārikas theses characteristic of the Lokottaravādins. Vasumitra attributes them jointly to the Mahāsāṇghikas, Ekavyāvahārikas and Kukkuṭikas, and Vinītadeva attributes to the Lokottaravādins all the theses that the other two attribute to the Ekavyāvahārikas and the Mahāsāṇghikas, Therefore it is <28> probable that the Lokottaravādins were scarcely separate from the Ekavyāvahārikas
3) The three traditions agree in having the *Bahuśrutīyas* and the *Prajñaptivādins* arise together at a date later than that of the appearance of the two or three preceding big sects. The two non-Kashmirian traditions make them arise from the Gokulikas, which is quite possible. This specification may come from information furnoished by the Bahuśrtīyas, whose presence in the land of Andhra, close to the centers of these two traditions, is attested by an inscription.
4) The three traditions agree in making the *Caitikas* arise at a still later date. The tradition of the Sammatīyas makes them arise from the Gokulikas. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that the presence of the Caitikas is attested inb the land of Andhra by inscriptions, such as those of the Bahuśritīyas to whom the same origin is attributed.
5) The *Pūrvaśailas*, *Aparaśailas* or *Uttaraśailas* are unknown in the old traditions of the Theravādins and the Sammatīyas. This justifies the Kashmirian tradition which places their appearance still later.
6) The *Rājagirikas* and the *Siddhārthikas* are unknown in the traditions of the first era. But the Mahāsāṇghika tradition of the second era places them in thi9s group and Buddhaghosa, in the 4th century, attributes to them clearly Mahāsāṇghika theses.

II. *The Sthaviras*

1) The *Haimavatas* are unknown in the early Ceylon tradition and the Kashmirian Mahāsāṇghika tradition of the same era. Vasumitra and the Sammitīyas make it a very orthodox Sthavira sect completely separate from the other sects of this group. The Kashmirian tradition of Bhavya, which also dates from the first era, makes its very name a synonym of Sthavira. On the contrary, the two traditions of the second era make it a Mahāsāṇghika sect and place it among the Mahāsāṇghika sects of the land of Andhra, which seems to be in contradiction with its name which clearly reflects a southern origin. We would not be too far wrong in considering the Haimavatas as a group, isolated in the Himālaya, of Sthaviras remaining very orthodox as a result of their isolation and who at first were not at all distinct from the Sthaviras. Later, towards the 4th century, they became a separate sect. Still later, in the 5th or 6th century, they became profoundly influenced by the Mahāsāṇghika sects, perhaps by missionaries from central Andhra, and might thenceforth be considered as belonging to the Mahāsāṇghika group.
2) The Vātsīputrīyas are known to the three traditions (except for Vasumitra, for a reason) as coming directly and in the first place from the Sthaviras. The three traditions agree in establishing that the Dharmottarīyas, the Bhadrayānīyas, the Sammatīyas and the Saṇṇagarikas are the four subdivisions of this group. Thus there is no doubt to be held regarding this point.
3) Contrary to Vasumitra who has all the Sthavira sects coming from the Sarvāstivādins, the Theravādin tradition makes them all come out of the Mahīśāsaka except for the group of the Vātsīputrīyas. But Vasumitra is a Sarvāstivādin, whereas in the south the latter are unknown in contrast to the Mahīśāsakas. <29> Thus these two traditions distort the truth, each to the profit of its own sect. The tradition of the Sammatīyas and that of the Kashmirian Haimavatas agree in a compomise solution: apart from the Haimavatas and the group of the Vātsīputrīyas, all the other Sthavira sects came from the Sarvāstivādins. Indeed, we have an entire collection of documents (*Kathāvatthu, Vijñānakāya*, Vasumitra, Bhavya, Vinītadeva) that prove to us that the Theravādins, the Mahīśāsakas and the Kāśyapīyas rejected the fundamental thesis of the Sarvāstivādins. In this case, it seems inappropriate to call the Sthaviras Sarvāstivādin before they became divided into Sarvāstivādins and non-Sarvāstivādins (Theravādin, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, etc.) or Vibhajyavādins. It would be better to keep the name *Sthavira* for them.
4) The Kashmirian and Ceylonese traditions agree in making the *Dharmaguptakas* come from the Mahīśasakas, and that does not contradict the tradition of the Sammatīyas.
5) All the traditions agree in having the *Kāśyapīyas* appear after the Dharmaguptakas, but are in disagreement as to their origin. The Ceylonese make them come directly from the Sarvāstivādins and hence indirectly from the Mahīśasakas; the Sammitīyas and the Mahāsāṇghikas of the South place them beside the Mahīśasakas; the Sammitīyas and the Mahāsāṇghikas of the South place them in the sub-group of the Vibhajyavādins; the Mahāsāṇghikas of Kashmir seem to make them derive directly from the Sthaviras; Vasumitra clearly makes them a subdivision of the Sarvāstivādins. Since we know (*Kathāvatthu, Satyasiddhiśāstra*, Vasumitra, Bhavya, Vinītadeva)

that their fundamental thesis represents a compromise between the Sarvāstivādin and non-Sarvāstivādin theses, we can make them come directly from the Sthavira group, but a little later than the Sarvāstivādins and the Mahīśāsakas.

6) Vasumitra and the Sammitīyas identify the *Sautrāntikas* with the *Sāṇkrāntivādins*. The Mahāsāṇghikas of Kashmir and the Theravādins make them into two distinct but closely related sects. Only the Mahāsāṇghikas of Kashmir have them coming directly from the Sthaviras and not, as all the other renditions, from the Sarvāstivādins. All the traditions seem to agree in considering them as the last one or ones of the sects appearing in the Sthavira group.
7) The *Ceylonese Sthaviras* form a separate group composed of three sects in the Mulasarvāstivādin lists. Its composition is confirmed in the Ceylonese Chronicles, but it is difficult to place this group in the chart of the first era; even that of Ceylon does not mention them. Study of the *Kathāvatthu* and the *Vinayas* shows us that it belongs to a non-Sarvāstivādin Sthavira group, but that it is distinct both from the Mahīśāsakas which it resembles more, from the Dharmagupatkas whose *Vinaya* is very different, and from the Kāśyapīyas. We must be resigned to making them a special group.

Here then is the chart that may be reconstituted according to this discussion of the facts, a chart that should represent with some certainty the real affiliation of the sects: <30>
{Here will be placed a xerox of the chart from the original French}

<31> CHAPTER II

The appearance of the sects

The title of this chapter is quite ambitious as the poverty of our documents on the question renders very uncertain the writing, never exact and definitive, on this question.

1.The Mahāsāṇghikas

The first great schism, the one that split the Community, undivided until then, into Sthaviras and Mahāsāṇghikas, is the one upon which we have by far the most documents. Unfortunately, the latter are far from agreeing and it is necessary to postpone their detailed and critical study to a later work.[15] Here, therefore, it is a matter of a rapid sketch, based, however, upon a serious work.

The first great schism is later than the council of Vaiśālī, of which all the sects give an appreciably similar account in their *Vinayapiṭakas*, and which these agree in dating at 100-110 E.N. (era of Nirvāṇa).[16] If it were earlier, the story of the Mahāsāṇghika Vinaya would differ much more than the others and, since it is a matter of describing a quarrel, the sects would have chosen the story of the first schism, so important, rather than that of the council of Vaiśalī, quite secondary.

Various sources agree in explaining the great schism by means of the five propositions of Mahādeva concerning the nature of the Arhant, which the Sthaviras, not very numerous but erudite, rejected, and which the Mahāsāṇghikas, more numerous but less learned, adopted. According to these same sources, the event took place at Pāṭaliputra in the first half of the 2nd century E.N., and the Sammitīyas of Bhavya even specify: in 137 E.N. in the reign of Nanda and Mahāpadma, i.e., in 480 – 137 = about 343 B.C.E.[17] Some late Kashmirian sources (Vasumitra) give 100, 110 or 116 E.N., under Dharmāśoka, but this is contested by the silence of other older Kashmirian sources of diverse origins (*Vibhāṣā, Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*) which, while formally recognizing the role of arbitrator played by the king of Magadha on this occasion, do not give his name and do not specify the date. If the king had been Dharmāśoka, the great protector of Buddhism, his name would not have been forgotten by these two texts. On the other hand, placing Dharmāśoka at the beginning of the 2nd century E.N. is impossible.[18]

Consequently, we can place the schism of the Mahāsāṇghikas at about 140 E.N. <32> or 340 B.C.E., at Pāṭaliputra, under the kings Nanda and Mahāpadma who arbitrated the conflict and gave the decision to the majority, i.e., to the Mahāsāṇghikas. The latter adopted the five propositions of Mahādeva on the Arhat and separated from the Sthaviras who rejected them.

---

[15] *Étude d'ensemble sur les premiers conciles bouddhiques, chap. III*.
[16] Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśālī*, passim.
[17] If there is Nanda and Mahāpadma in 137 E.N., the Nirvāṇa must have occurred about 480. There is agreement between the Sammitīyas and the Theravādins.
[18] Bareau: *La date du Nirvāṇa*, J.A. vol. CCXLI, fasc. 1, p. 27-62.

2. The Ekavyāhārikas, Lokottaravādins and Gokulikas

The sources of the North-west agree in dating their appearance in the 2nd century E.N, and Paramārtha attributes the origin of their separation in disagreement over the authenticity of the *Mahāyānasūtras*.[19] It is impossible to verify either of these facts. Moreover, the lapse of time between the first schism and this one, at most half a century, is apparently much too short to account for the evolution of the Mahāsāṇghikas toward the Mahāyāna and the elaboration of the major sūtras of the latter. Either the schism is later than one or two centuries or else it had another argument as origin. The problem is all the more complicated since we do not know whether or not it is appropriate to identify the Ekavyāvahārikas with the Lokottaravādins, and since we do not know the exact form of the name of the Gokulikas and consequently its interpretation, which would be useful to us. It is possible that the schism took place around the end of the 2nd century E.N., or about 300 B.C.E., and was caused by controversies concerning certain pre-Mahāyānist tendencies of the Mahāsānghikas, either in their buddhology as the name Lokottaravādin suggests, or in their ontology as the name Ekavyāvahārikas would have us believe, and that these tendencies were recorded in the new sūtras, the first rough drafts of the *Mahāyānasūtras*. That is just a hypothesis, but we should not forget that in the 2nd century we are still in the period of full elaboration and compilation of the *Sūtrapiṭakas*, as attested by the numerous texts of these collections that exist in Pāli but not in Chinese, and vice versa.

3.The Bahuśrutiyas and the Prajñaptivādins

These two sects seem to have arisen from an internal split provoked among the Gokulikas by an argument concerning, according to Paramārtha, the superficial and profound meaning of the Scriptures, the relative truth and the absolute truth.

According to the Kashmirian sources, this schism was the last of the 2nd centrury E.N. and occurred therefore in the first quarter of the 3rd century B.C.E., about 290. But, since these sources have a definite tendency to make all the sects coming from the Mahāsāṇghikas prior to those arising from the Sthaviras, which is suspect *a priori* as being too systematic, we may believe that the schism of the Bahuśrutīyas and the Prajñaptivādins is later than this period. In placing it in the first half of the 3rd century E.N., perhaps about 250 B.C.E., we would not be too far from the truth.

4. *The Caitikas*

The date of appearance of this school is likewise unknown. The sources of the North-west place it either at the end of the 2nd century E.N. or at the beginning of the 3rd century E.N., i.e., about 200 E.N., 280 B.C.E. The Caitikas may have appeared towards the end of the 3rd century E.N., about 200 B.C.E. According to Paramārtha, a new Mahādeva spread discord in the minds due to false ordinations and, banished by all, he withdrew with his disciples into the <33> mountains. Since the only inscription that names them was found at Amarāvati and that the collection of traditions and lists relates them to the sects said to be Andhaka, it is

[19] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes*, p. 43.

permissible to think that the Caitikas, driven out of the Ganges valley, founded the great Buddhist center of the land of Andhra.

5.*The Pūrvaśailas and the Aparaśailas*

They are unknown in two of the three oldest lists, and the latter come from regions close to their chosen country, the land of Andhra. This silence seems to indicate a late origin, perhaps during the 1st century B.C.E. The two sects represent schools issuing from the Caitikas, but it is completely unknown what differentiated them and, even amongst themselves, if this is not two different places of residence, albeit neighboring.

6.The Rājagirikas and the Siddhārthikas

Unknown to all the early lists, these two sects of the land of Andhra seem very late, perhaps even of the 3rd or 4th century of our era. We know nothing of what gave rise to them and what differentiated them from the other Abdhaka sects apart from a few theses of secondary interest.

7.*The Vātsīputrīyas*

All the traditions agree in making the schism in which the Vātsīputrīyas arose the first that split the Sthavira group and so placing them about 200 E.N., i.e., 280 B.C.E. It was provoked by the teaching of personalism (*pudgalavāda*) by Vātsīputra.

8.The Sammatīyas, Bhadrayānīyas, Dharmottarīyas and Saṇṇagarikas

These four sects, all having come from the Vātsīputrīyas, appeared between the 3rd century B.C.E and the 1st century C.E., but the precise dates are unknown. Their order of appearance seems to have been: Dharmottarīyas, Bhadrayānīyas, Sammatīyas and Saṇṇagarikas. We do not know who caused their appearance, and we hardly know what differentiated them.

9.The Sarvāstivādins and the Vibhajyavādins

The second controversy that divided the Sthaviras concerned the pan-realism (*sarvāstivāda*) taught by Kātyāyanīputra and refuted by Maudgalīputra. It can be placed in the middle of the 3rd century B.C.E. and we may suppose that this was what caused the assembly by Dharmāśoka of a second council at Pātaliputra, following which Maudgalīputra and the Vibhajyavādins prevailed against Kātyānīputra and the Sarvāstivādins who were exiled or exiled themselves and who went to convert Kashmir.[20]

10.The Kāśyapīyas

The appearance of the Kāśyapīyas, whose main thesis represents a compromise between that of the Sarvāstivādins and that of the Vibhajyavādins, was later than the schism which separated the last two sects, for it was produced <34> at a time when the argument concerning realism was still heated. If the second

[20] Cf. L.V.P.: *L'Inde au temps des Maurya*, p. 133-9.

council of Pāṭaliputra dates at 244 B.C.E, the arising of the Kāśyapīyas may be fixed at the decade 240-230 B.C.E.

11.The Mahīśāsakas and the Theravādins

It seems that these two sects are just continental and Ceylonese varieties of the Vibhajyavādins, having become distinct in the course of time due to their geographical separation, increased by some political events such as the struggle of the Ceylonese against the Tamil invaders in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.E. This separation favored a distinct evolution of these two parts of the Vibhajyavādin sect.

12.The Dharmaguptakas

All the sources agree in having them come from the Mahīśāsakas and give to them the Kāśyapīyas as daughter-sect, more or less formally and directly. However, it seems to be difficult to place the appearance of the Dharmaguptakas in the 10 or 15 years that we have just attributed to the interval separating the birth of the Vibhajyavādins, therefore the Mahīśāsakas, from that of the Kāśyapīyas. However that may be, we are not making too grave a mistake in making them appear in the last half of the 3rd century B.C.E. It seems that the schism that separated them from the Mahīśāsakas had as its origin the arguments on the respective values of generosity to the Buddha and generosity to the Saṇgha and on the identity or difference between the careers of the Buddha and the Śāvakas.

13.The Sautrāntikas

All the sources agree in considering them as the last of the sects to come from the Sthaviras, and the lists of the North-west place their appearance in the 4th century E.N, or about 150 C.E at the earliest. The two names of this school, Sautrāntika and Saṇkrāntivādin, cause uncertainty about the propositions that obliged them to separate from the Sarvāstivādins: they recognized the authority only of the Sūtras and not of the Abhidharma and they maintained that the five aggregates transmigrate from one existence to the next.

14.The Haimavatas

All that concerns the nature and history of this not very important sect is an enigma. <35>

CHAPTER III

The expansion of Buddhism and the geographical distribution of the sects

The entire history of the Buddha took place in a territory going from Kapilavastu in the north to Bodh-Gaya in the south and from Kauśāmbī in the west to Rājagṛha in the east, a territory including also the cities of Śrāvastī in the north-west, Vārāṇasī and Pāṭaliputra on the Ganges and Vaiśālī in the lower Gandaki. This represents a quadrilateral of about 500 km. from east to west and 400 km. from north to south, centered on the middle Ganges.

The stories of the council of Vaiśālī, which all the Vinayas but one agree in dating at 100 or 110 years after the Nirvāṇa, call Saṃkāśya, Kaṇyākubja, Mathurā,[21] which indicates that at that era the territory of Buddhism extended to the north-west, going from the Ganges valley and its tributaries on the right bank and spreading about 500 km. in this direction.

But the great expansion certainly dates from the reign of Aśoka. Buddhism clearly was to profit from his zealous faith. As the Theravādin and Sarvāstivādin traditions have it, it was at this time apparently that Ceylon and Kashmir were evangelized, as were also Gandhāra, Surāṣṭra and Mahārāṣṭra. This vast expansion of Buddhism across all of India undoubtedly encouraged the regional particulars of the doctrine and hastened and accentuated the internal divisions of the Community. This is the way we have notably tried above to explain the distinction between the Theravādins and the Mahīśāsakas.

Basing themselves on the comparison between the stories of the council of Vaiśālī in the various *Vinayas*, Przyluski and Hofinger[22] thought they could deduce the directions in which each of the major sects directed its efforts of evangelization starting from the original domain. According to them, the Mahāsāṇghikas occupied the eastern part of the latter, the Sarvāstivādins went back up the valley of the Ganges in the direction of Kashmir in the north-west, the Dharmaguptaka moved toward the west, whereas the Mahīśāsakas and Theravādins, by the Avanti, went toward the gates of the Surāṣṭra. This state of affairs happened at the era immediately preceding the great Aśokan expansion when the sects had just separated. These are the major indices that we have on the geographical distribution of the sects, but the interpretations of Przyluski and Hofinger are not beyond criticism.[23] <36>

[21] Przysluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 307, 330; Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśālī*, p. 183-195. We have seen above that the argument resting on the Mahāvāntaka-Mahīśāsaka identification presented by Przyluski (p. 325) and repeated by Hofinger (p. 192) is unfounded, being based on a faulty reading.
[22] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 307-330. Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśālī*, p. 183-195. We have seen above that the argument based on the Mahāvāntaka-Mahīśāsaka identification presented by Przyluski, p. 325) and repeated by Hofinger (p. 192) is baseless, coming from a faulty reading.
[23] Cf. Bareau: *Étude d'ensemble sur les premiers conciles bouddhiques*, chap. II.

We do not have much more information before the 2nd century C.E. At that time, inscriptions inform us of the presence of:[24]

a) Sarvāstivādins: near Peshawar, in the west of Kashmir, at Mathurā and at Śrāvastī;
b) Mahāsāṇghikas: at Mathurā, at Karle and near Kabul;
c) Caitikas: at Amarāvatī;
d) Sammatīyas: at Mathurā;
e) Dharmottarīyas: at Karle and at Junnar;
f) Bhadrayānīyas: at Nāsik and at Kanheri.

Inscriptions of the 3rd century attest to the presence of:

a) Mahīśāsakas: at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and at Banavasi;
b) Pūrvaśailas and Aparaśailas: at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa;
c) Bahuśrutīyas: at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa;
d) Kāśyapīyas: at Takṣaśilā and area.

Inscriptions of the 4th century mention the presence of:

a) Sarvāstivādins: in the north-west of Baluchistan;
b) Sammatīyas: at Sārnāth.

Inscriptions of the 5th century attest to the presence of:

a) Bahuśrutīyas: near Peshawar;
b) Kāśyapīyas: near Peshawar;
c) Mahīśāsakas: south of Takṣaśila.

Finally, in the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang and then I-tsing give us precious information on the geographical and numerical distribution of the sects. At the beginning of this century, the former gives the following distribution of the number of monks (m) and monasteries (M):[25]

Sarvāstivādins: Karachar (10 M, 2000m), Koucha (100 M, 5000 m), Aksou (50 M, 1000m), Koundouz (10 M, 300m), Tamavāsana [between Śākala and Jālandhara] (1M, 300m), Matipur (10 M, 600 m), Kanauj (3 M, 500 m), Ayamukha [near Prayāga] (1 M, 200 m), Vārāṇasī (2000 m), around Nālandā (1 M, 200 m), Iraṇaparvata [Mongyr] (2 M, 1000 m), Bhilmal (1 M, 100 m), Khabanda [Pamir] (10 M, 500 m), Wu-sa [near Tash-Kurgan] (10 M, 1000 m), Niya (1 M, few m).

Sammatīyas: Ahicchatra [near Saṃkāśya] 10 m, 1000 m, Saṃkāśya (5 M, 2000 m), Ayamukha [near Prayāga] (5M, 1000m, Viśokha [between Kauśāmbhī and Śrāvastī] about 100 M, few m), Kapilavastu (1M, 30 or 3000m ?), Vaiśālī (1 M, few m), Vārāṇasī (1 M, few m), Iraṇaparvata [Mongyr] (10M, 3000m), Karṇasuvarṇa [north of Orissa] (10 M, 2000 m), Mālava (about 100M, 20000 m), Valabhī (100 M, 6000 m), Anandapura (10 M, 1000 m), Sindh [west of Multān] (about 100 M, 10000 m), Parvata [north-west of

[24] For references, see the various chapters of Part II.
[25] Some of these numbers are calculated following the approximations of Hiuan-tsang: "most of…", "almost all…"

Multān] (not specified), Mouths of the Indus (80M, 4000 m), Pitāśilā [Pattala] (50 M, 3000 m), Avaṇṭa [north-west of Pattala] (20 M, 1500 m). <37>

Mahāsāṇghikas: province west of Kashmir (1 M, 100 m), Dhanakaṭaka (20 M, 800 m), Andarab [north of Afghanistan] (3 M, 50 m).

Sthaviras: Samataṭa (30 M, 2000 m), Draviḍa (100 M, 10000 m).

Mahāyāna Sthaviras:[26] Bodh-Gayā (1 M, 1000 m), Kaliṇga (10 M, 500 m), Ceylon (not specified), Bhārukaccha (10 M, 300 m), Surāṣṭra (50 M, 2500 m).

Sautrāntikas: Śrughna [near Sthāneswar] (not specified).

Lokottaravādins: Bāmiyān (about 10 M, about 1000 m).

Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas, Dharmaguptakas: their *Vinayas* were studied by degenerate Mahāyāna monks in Uḍḍiyāṇa.

Hīnayāna (not specified): Balkh (100 M, 3000 m), Paluṣa [near Puṣkaravatī (1 M, 50 m), Kapiśa (20 M, 1000 m), Ku-lu-t'o (south-west pf Jālandhara] (4 M, 200 m, Khotan (20 M, 1000 m), Śākala (1 M, 100 m), Pāryātra [near Mathurā (8 M, few m), Sthāneswar (3 M, 700 m), Śrughna [near Sthāneswar] (4 M, 800 m), Goviśana [near Sāṃkāśya] (2 M, 100 m), Prayāga (2 M, few m), Kauśāmbī (10 M, 300 m), Tchan-tchu (?) [west of Vaiśālī] 10 M, 1000 m), near Nālandā (1 M, 50 m), Champā (about 10 M, 200 m), Magadha (10 M, 2000 m).

Mahāyāna: Kapiśa (80 M, 5000 m), Lampaka (10 M, few m), Palusa [near Puskaravatī] (1 M, 50 m), Uḍḍuiyāṇa (long beforehand: 1400 M, 18000 m; at the beginning of the 7th century: few m), Takṣaśilā (many M, few m), region east of Takṣaśilā (2 M, 300 m), Ku-lu-t'o [south-east pf Jālandhara] (16 M, 800 m). P'i-lo-shan-na [west of Sāṃkāśya] 92 M, 300 m), Mahāśāla [west of Vaiśālī] (several M, a certain number of m), Śvetapura [south of Vaiśālī] (not specified), Magadha (40 M, 8000 m), Puṇyavarhana [at the arising of the Ganges delta] (1 M, 700 m), Orissa (100 M, 10000 m), Mahākośala [region of Hagpur] (100 M, 10000 m), Parvata [north-east of Multān] (1 M, 100 m), Varaṇa [south of Multān] (about 10 M, 300 m), Tsao-ku-t'a (Ghazno region] (about 100 M, 10000 m), Yarkhand (about 10 M, 100 m), Khotan (80 M, 4000 m), Śrughna [near Sthāneswar (1 M, 200 m), Kashmir (1 M, 30 m), Harīpur (1 M, few m).

Two Vehicles (together): Jālandhara (50 M, 2000 m), Mathrā (20 M, 2000 m), Kanauj (100 M, 10000 m), Ayodhyā (100 M, 3000 m), Vṛjji (10 M, 1000 m), Nepal (2000 m), Puṇyavarhana (at the arising of the Ganges delta (20 M, 3000 m), Koṇkanapura [Bombay region] (100 M, 10000 m), Mahārāṣṭra (100 M, 5000 m), K'i-t'a [north-west of Mālava] (10 M, 1000 m), Ujjayinī (about 10 M, 300 m), Parvata [north-west of Multān] (10 M, 1000 m), Lang-ka-lo [Baluchistan] (100 M, 6000 m), Huoh [near Kunduz] (10 M, about 100 m).

Indeterminate: Termed (10 M, 1000 m), Hu-lin [between Termed and Kunduz] (10 M, 500 m), region between Termed and Hu-lin (12 M, 300 m), Nagahāra (many M, few m), Gandhāra (1000 M, no m), Bolor [east of Uḍḍiyāṇa] (about 100 M, about 1000 m), Kashmir (100 M, 5000 m), Punach [west of Kashmir] (5 M, few m), Rājapura [west of Kashmir] (10 M, few m), Takka [west of Kashmir (10 M, few m), Tchi-na-pou-ti {south of Śākala] (10 M), Che-to-t'u-lu [south of Jālandhara] (10 M, few m), Brahmapura [south-

[26] Perhaps 'Mahāyāna and Sthavira' should be understood.

east of Matipur] (5 M, few m), Vaiśālī (about 100 M, few m), Nālandā (about 1000 m), Kajaṇgala [east of Champā] (6 or 7 M, 300 m), Tāmralipti (10 M, 1000 m), Veṇgī (20 M, 3000 m), Malakuṭa [southern <38> India] (many M, few m), Tchi-tchi-t'o [north-east of Ujjayinī] (about 10 M, few m), Multān (10 M, few m), Khost (south of Kunduz] (3 M, few m), Badakchan (3 or 4 M, few m), Kuraṇa [near Badakchan] few M, few m), Dharmasthiti (on the Upper Oxus] (10 M, few m), Chang-mi [in the Pamit] (2 M, few m).

In summary, Hiuan-tsang knew only three large sects of the Hīnayāna, i.e., the Sammatīyas, the Sarvāstivādins and the Sthaviras. The *Sammatīyas*, more than 65000 monks in about 1000 monasteries, were present above all in Mālava, Valabhī on the lower Indus and the lower Ganges, but they were also found dispersed in all of Madhyadeśa, all in all, in the region between the lower Indus and the lower Ganges, predominantly in the west. The *Sarvāstivādins*, more than 16000 monks in more than 500 monasteries, were especially numerous at Kachgar, Aksou and Koucha, thus in central Asia, but were also found in the north of Afghanistan, scattered throughout Madhyadeśa, on the lower Ganges, spreading out towards the north-east and southwest starting from the center in the extreme north-west of India. The *Sthaviras*, more than 20000 monks in more than 200 monasteries, were very numerous in the Draviḍa land and in Ceylon and were well represented at Samataṭa and Surāṣṭra, their main home being southern India, their secondary homes being the mouth of the Ganges and of the Narbadā, the two gates through which pilgrims to Magadha passed. The *Lokottaravādins*, also very numerous, were concentrated at Bāmiyān, in the west of Afghanistan. The Mahāsāṇghikas, almost entirely disappeared, 1000 monks in 20 monasteries, were still represented in Kashmir and the north-west of Afghanistan, and on the lower Kṛṣṇā, their last important stronghold. The adepts of the Mahāyāna, more than 70000 monks in more than 1000 monasteries, were particularly numerous in Kapiśa, Magadha, Orissa, Mahākośala, in the east of Afghanistan and Khotan, but they were found also in the extreme north-west of India, scattered in the Madhyadeśa, on the lower Ganges, the middle Indus and at Yarkhand, having their main stronghold in the north-east of Afghanistan and especially the group Magadha-Orissa-Mahākośala.

Buddhism was thus well represented throughout most of India and central Asia. Hiuan-tsang counted in all more than 200,000 monks living in about 7000 monasteries of which a third were in ruins. Some regions, where it was prospering, seemed to be characterized by the fact that very diverse sects and both Vehicles were living side by side. These were: Kashmir, the entire Ganges basin with Jālandhara, Mathurā, Ayodhyā, Puṇyavardhana and especially Nālandā and Kanauj, Veṇgī at the mouth of the Godaverī, Konkan and Mahārāṣṭra.

But Hiuan-tsang notes sadly the ruins that he encountered in regions where Buddhism, formerly flourishing, had almost disappeared. These were: Gandhāra and Uḍḍiyāna, wealthy in traces of their grand past: the extreme north of Punjab with Takṣaśilā, Punach and especially Ṭakka; Pāryātra and Kauśāmbī, but also Śrāvastī, Kapilavastu, Vaiśālī, the holiest cities of Buddhism, and Champā; Dhanaṭaka, near ancient Amarāvatī; Choḷya, southwest of the latter; Malakuṭa, in the extreme south of India; Ujjayinī and its

neighbor called Tch'i-tchi-t'oṣ by the Chinese pilgrim; Multān and Varaṇa on the middle Indus; Yarkand in central Asia.

The report of I-tsing is much shorter. According to him, the *Mahāsāṇghikas* are present in Magadha, less numerous in the west of India (Lāṭa and Sindhu) <39> than in the south and the north. They are mixed with other Buddhists in the west of India but not in Ceylon. They were introduced at a late date into Sumatra and Java. Some are found in Chen-si.

The *Sthaviras* are numerous in the south of India where they form almost the entire Community. They are found in smaller numbers in the west (Lāṭa and Sindhu) and in the east, but not in the north. They were introduced slowly into Sumatra and Java but they are not found in China.

The *Mūlasarvāstivādins* are in the majority in Magadha and constitute almost the entire Community in the north of India. A few are found in the west and south, and they are present in the east along with adepts of the other sects. They form almost the entire Community in Java and Sumatra. A few are found at Tchampa. They flourish in all of southern China.

The *Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas* and *Kāśyapīyas* have completely disappeared in India proper, but there are still some adepts in Uḍḍiyāna, at Karachar and Khotan, but not in Ceylon. They flourish in all of southern China. Dharmaguptakas are found in eastern China and at Chen-si. They are numerous in Java and Sumatra.

The *Sammatīyas* are very flourishing in western India (Lāṭa and Sindhu). They occur in Magadha and in the east, but there are but few of them in the south and none in the north or in Ceylon. There are a few in Java and Sumatra and at Tchampa they are in the majority. They are not found in China.

In the approximately 70 years that separate the voyage of I-tsing from that of Hiuan-tsang, the situation had hardly changed.

Indeed, it seems that the geographic distribution of the sects varied little between the first inscriptions of the 2nd century and the report of I-tsing in the last years of the 7th century, an interval of more than 500 years. All that we can note with certainty is the disappearance of some sects, and even of Buddhism, in certain regions.

In the first seven centuries of our era, the distribution as following:

In Madhyadeśa and Magadha, countries of the great pilgrimages, the holy shared domain, all the sects are represented living side by side.

The *Mahāsāṇghikas* have two large centers: the extreme north-west (Kashmir, Gandhāra, Kapiśa, Uḍḍiyāṇa, Bāmiyān), domain of the oldest sects, Mahāsāṇghika proper and Lokottaravādin, and the region of Amarāvatī, domain of the more recent sects, Caitika, Pūrvaśaila and Aparaśaila; the Bahuśrutīyas, appearing at an intermediate era, are present here and there, thus assuring some kind of liaison. But the

invasion of the Huns in the 6th century and the revival of Śivaism somewhat later, both in the north-west and in the south-east of India, hastened their disappearance. On the other hand, the development of the Mahāyāna, from the beginning of our era, must have affected the Mahāsāṇghikas much more than the adepts of the other sects due to the leanings of their doctrines.

The *Sarvāstivādins* have as their major centers the extreme north-west (Kashmir, Gandhāra Uḍḍiyāna, Kapiśa) and the Ganges valley. The invasion of the Huns in the 6th century considerably reduced their numbers in the former area, undoubtedly to the profit of the latter. Their literature proves that the north-west was their principal center at the beginning of our era, the stronghold of the second domain being definitely later.

The *Sthaviras* have Ceylon and southern India as their major center, and Samataṭa and Surāśṭra as secondary centers. <40>

The *Sammatīyas* have become the predominant sect of the Vātsiputrīyas and in number by far the most important of the Hīnayāna in the 7th century. Well represented everywhere in the lower Ganges and the lower Indus, they have their main center in the west of India and secondary center in the lower Ganges.

The *Bhadrayānīyas* and the *Dharmottarīyas* are not mentioned, and in the 2nd century, only in the narrow area east of Bombay, thus at the southern limit of the main Sammatīya center.

The *Kāśyapīyas* are mentioned only in the north-west (Gandhāra, Uḍḍiyāna) and they have disappeared from India proper before 600, probably due to the Huns.

The *Mahīśāsakas* are mentioned in the north-west (Gandhāra, Uḍḍiyāna) and in the south (Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, Banavasī), but they have completely disappeared from India before 600.

The *Dharmaguptakas* seem to have been represented only in the north-west (Uḍḍiyāna) and to have disappeared from India before 600.

According to Tāranātha, between the time of Vasubandhu (4th century) and that of Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti (7th century), several schools had disappeared: the Pūrvaśaila, the Aparaśaila, the Haimavata, the Kāśyapīya, the Vibhajyavādin, the Mahāvihāravāsin and the Avaṇtaka. It is wrong that the Mahāvihāravāsins had disappeared – they underwent a temporary eclipse in prestige. According to Tāranātha, under the Pāla kings (9th-10th centuries), there remained only six schools: the Vātsīputrīyas, the Kaurukullakas, the Prajñaptivādins, the Lokottaravādins, the Tāmraśātīyas and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. He forgets the Mahāvihāravāsins of Ceylon, but it seems that Tāranātha's information was valid only for the Ganges basin, the domain of the Pālas and the last refuge of Buddhism in the territory of India proper.

The geographical distribution of the sects should not be represented according to a system of well-defined territories consisting of the exclusive strongholds of such and such a school. To the contrary, the collection of documents that we have just cited and studied invites us to see things in quite another light. The regions

where they note the presence of adepts of a single sect are rare. At the very most, a given city seems to have been attached exclusively to such and such a school for unknown, probably accidental, reasons. In general, although a sect has a more or less marked predominance in a given region, other sects also reside there. Indeed, it seems, according to some indications, that the order of these predominances varied during the centuries, some schools declining or even disappearing while others took their place. Various and variable circumstances in the course of history have played their part in this distribution: geographical circumstances, such as insular or mountainous isolation preserved some schools from very noticeable external influences, or on the other hand, such as the great intermingling of ideas that occurred along the great paths of transit; religious circumstances, such as the influx of pilgrims around the great centers of pilgrimage; historical circumstances, such as the favor or disfavor of a given prince or a given dynasty towards such and such a school, or such as the invasion of barbarian peoples, Scythians, Kuchanese, Huns or Moslems; economic circumstances, such as the famines obliging the monks to leave a region where they were residing, or such as the favor shown by rich merchants, notably these 'sea merchants' who seem to have played an important role in the expansion of Buddhism.

But that several sects were represented jointly in almost all the regions of immense India, it does not follow that all the schools <41> were represented throughout. The information of Hiuan-tsang and especially of I-tsing are quite clear on this point. There was, however, a region where all the sects had adherents: the area of the great pilgrimages, i.e., the basin if the middle Ganges, Magadha and Madhyadeśa, where Buddhism had been born and which it had made into its stronghold. The Chinese pilgrims note, in this extended territory, the existence of vast monasteries-hostelries founded and maintained by princes or wealthy merchants of distant regions to shelter, in these sacred places, the pilgrims who had come from their country. I-tsing formally attests the presence of representatives of all the schools in this region, as simple reasoning allows one to assume. <42>

CHAPTER IV

The causes for division and the relationships among the sects[27]

There is no example of a spiritual or intellectual movement having had a large number of adepts and having endured for some time that has not sooner or later become divided. Divisions of this order have multiple causes, varying with the circumstances. It is possible to determine some of the causes that have provoked the appearance of the sects and schools in the early Buddhist Community.

The first cause is obviously the absence of supreme authority. When the Buddha entered into Parinirvāṇa, the Community, for reasons that have escaped us, did not name any successors. In Buddhism there has not been any central organism corresponding to the papacy in Christianity or the caliphate in Islam. The later traditions of the majority of the sects, however, depended upon lists of patriarchs, supreme chiefs, who successively directed the Community after the Buddha's death. But these lists, of which we have a good half-dozen, are quite different from one another[28] and this very disagreement proves, counter to the traditions, that in the Buddhist community there was never any central authority to safeguard its unity. The existence of these lists also proves that at a certain era, subsequent to which the great divisions were produced, some if not all sects felt the need for such authority and instituted a patriarchy. The history of the Theravādins, the only one that we know slightly, shows that this even partial authority never prevented dissent from being produced.

The division into sects and schools is particularly frequent in India as it is observed outside of Buddhism, in Hinduism and Jainism. It seems that that there are many reasons for it. The Indian is deeply individualistic as is proved by his religions that all seek individual salvation in a kind of universal 'everyman for himself'. India is perhaps the country where the mixing of races is most numerous and most diverse and the rigid caste system is but the reflection on the juridical level of an ethnographic reality. From all of this it follows that throughout its history India, which has had a powerful unity of civilization, has never, except once, known political unity. Yet there is a strict link between spiritual unity and political unity. This link is manifest in Islam where the caliph held both <43> spiritual and temporal authority up to the day when the empire fell apart and when the sects disappeared. Shi'ism, the traditional sect of Iran, betrayed the resistance of the Iranian empire to the hold, both political and religious, of the Omayyad caliphs. Christianity was organized on the level of the Roman empire and when that split in two, Christianity was not slow in dividing, as a reflection of that division, into the Eastern Church and the Western Church. The omnipotence of the pope ceased at the end of the Middle Ages, when the large states of Northern Europe

[27] See N. Dutt: *Early monastic Buddhism*, vol. II, p. 5-21. Idem: *Earl history of the spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist schools*. – Przyluski: *Légende de l'empereur Aśoka*, p. 1 sq. – Id., *Le concile de Rāhagṛha*, p. 307-331 and 329-331. – Hofinger: *Le concile de Vaiśālī*, p. 183-195*;* Demiéville: *A propos du concile de Vaiśālī,* T'oung-pao, vol. XL, 4-5, p. 258-261.

[28] Przyluki*: Légende d'Aśoka*, p. 61, 63, 118. – Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśālī*, p. 158, 206-212.

became conscious of their temporal primacy. Two hundred years earlier, the attempted rebellion of Philippe le Bel, then the most powerful sovereign in Europe, collided with the demands for temporal supremacy of the papacy. In India, on the contrary, apart from the ephemeral empire of Aśoka, nothing provided a political model for religious centralism. The permanent example of ever-changing political division could only abort any attempted supreme religious authority.

We have spoken about the Indian individualism. As an important consequence of this is the existence of monks (*śrāmaṇa*) who, like the Buddha, the Jina, and many others, broke all social links, those of clan, family and even caste, 'leaving home' in order to live as wanderers, respected by all, knowing a freedom so absolute that there are few other examples in the world. Some undoubtedly were not very interesting individuals, lazy, feeble-minded, etc., but there were many who lived in the most complete renunciation, in search of the Truth and of Deliverance. Their freedom manifested mainly on the spiritual level and, even when they were grouped into communities, the taste of intellectual independence remained active in them. To this should be added, amongst the Indians as in the Greeks, a veritable passion for philosophical discussion that did not spurn sophism.

If the Indians, like the majority of people, gladly based their argumentation on the teachings of a master, we must recognize that, thanks to their talents as exegetes and sophists, it was easy for them to derive anything they wanted from the words of a text. Their dogmatism, even while it existed, was purely formal: it was an act of veneration toward a teacher, no more and no less. They used a text when they had need of one, without thinking that they were obliged to respect its meaning or always to conform to it. This fundamental independence of mind, joined with a very broad tolerance, even though it did not go so far as to prevent disputes, did have a twofold result. On the one hand, it has been one of the main causes for multiplication of the sects and schools. On the other hand, it allowed India, like Greece, to attain a marvelous richness. As we will see, all is not just sophism worthy of scorn in the Indian mind and particularly in the Buddhist mind. The chance of circumstance has obliged the Indian, by paths assuredly quite different from ours, to reflect on the great problems of universal philosophy and to propose solutions some of which appeared in India fifteen ot twenty centuries earlier than in Europe.[29]

The institution of these wandering monks, so ancient in India is, for yet another reason, a cause of social division. The custom and even the necessity of ceaseless wandering in vast territories, alone or in small groups, encouraged the expansion of the doctrines, but also, by preventing continuous relations between <44> the groups of the same community, encouraged the appearance of local peculiarities. When each of these groups, from benefiting from the permanent generous gifts of a dynasty or a merchant guild, became settled in a monastery and had definitively left the itinerant life for the sedentary life, the unity of each of these local communities was more easily maintained, but the divisions between the various regions or the different monasteries already existed and was maintained or even accentuated.

[29] The opposite case also presents itself, and it is very difficult to decide the superiority of India or the Occident in Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

The expansion of Buddhism under Aśoka, directly connected with the political expansion of the Community over vast territory at a time when communications were long and difficult, contributed perhaps more than anything else to the division of the Community. When this immense empire collapsed, relations between the different local communities was rendered more difficult by the hostility of certain Indian princes such as Puśyamitra, and several local communities, over a longer or shorter period, endured and evolved separately, cut off from any relations with one another. Various influences, spiritual, economic, juridical, climatic, etc., were exerted on each of them, slowly transforming their modes of mind and life and accentuating their distinctive characteristics.

The movement of expansion of Buddhism under the reign of Aśoka is tied to his missionary spirit and may perhaps find its very origin in the desire of the great Indian emperor to spread the Dharma not only in India but also in the Hellenistic kingdoms as the famous 13th Rock Edict announces. It is almost certain that the tradition, according to which Aśoka sent missionaries to convert to Buddhism the most distant regions of India and the border regions to the east and the west, is but a reflection of this attempt both political and spiritual. Nevertheless, if there are reasons to suspect the official nature of the Buddhist missionary movement under Aśoka, it is hardly doubtful that, in his reign, encouraged by the direct support of the sovereign, himself a zealous Buddhist, the doctrine of the Buddha would spread throughout India and even beyond India, in the western and eastern course of the empire. Actually, it is at this time, rather short and the only time when entire India was unified by a native monarch, that the political conditions most favorable to this missionary movement were realized.

The last is not limited either to this brief period or to India proper. From the beginning of our era, Buddhist missionaries, accompanying the boldest of the Indian merchants across the seas of the south and the deserts of central Asia, expanded the doctrine in insular India and Indochina, in Serindia and China. In many of the Buddhist tales incorporated in the *Jātakas*, in the *Mahāvastu*, in the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, there are echoes of innumerable perils encountered by these pious travelers which show both their ardor in spreading the Buddhist faith as far from its cradle as possible and the difficulties of communication between the various secondary homes thus created by them in distant lands. Under these conditions, local peculiarities could easily develop and, in fact, although we have hardly any documents on early Buddhism in insular India, Indochina and Serindia, we know well that that of China, Korea, Japan and Tibet is very different from that of India. In these four cases, it is quite evident that the spirit of each of these lands has reacted vigorously and often victoriously against that of Indian Buddhism. The Indian schools <45> imported into the Far East stagnated for a long time before completely disappearing, whereas new schools, new sects, adapted to the psychological, cultural and economic conditions of these various countries soon arose and were brilliantly perpetuated up to our own time. What happened outside India indeed happened, even had to happen formerly, in India itself. We have two clear examples of these local peculiarities: the Ceylonese Theravādins and the Kashmirian Sarvāstivādins distinct from those of Gandhāra and even more so from those of Madhyadeśa. The insular isolation of the Theravādins, due to struggles against the Ceylonese and Tamils in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.E., is probably the main reason for the archaic and

conservative nature of their doctrine, by absence of evolution during the period when all the sects were elaborating their particular doctrines before recording them and fixing them into the *Abhidharmapiṭakas*.

Let us now come to the profound causes for the wandering spirit of Buddhism. It seems these are, essentially, economic causes. First of all, here is an example of this mechanism that is a consequence of the divisions that are to be explained. Traditions of very diverse origins tell that, during certain disagreements, the royal patronage having decided in favor of such and such of the litigants either because it was made up of the more numerous elements - a very democratic principle - or because the sovereign had yielded to certain influences, the vanquished party was exiled, sometimes of its own free will, but more often driven out by royal order or the pressure of circumstances. This is explained very easily. Officially recognized as heretics, as 'Community breakers', a very serious crime, subject to the scorn and anger of the lay people or at least of the majority of them, the vanquished scarcely was able to provide for the re-provisioning of fresh stores in their residence and were thus forced to repatriate in search of what could be called 'a prospecting area'. And yet they could hardly find that in a territory where the Buddhist faith had not yet germinated and where they did not dare to enter into rivalry with other communities. This phenomenon of spiritual colonization is found elsewhere than in Buddhism. The expedition of the 'Mayflower' is a good example insofar as Christianity is concerned.

Putting aside this phenomenon, which is, in fact, a consequence of the divisions, let us return to the economic origins of the expansion which often provoked the former. The itinerant nature of Buddhism, which ceased each year only during the rainy season because at that time it is impossible to travel, results from the mode of life of the monks. Indeed, the latter were dedicated entirely to the contemplative life and to the teaching of the doctrine. They carried out no manual labor, thus no materially productive activity such as agriculture, livestock farming, or craft industry. To the contrary, they ate, little as it was, which created a double disadvantage for the society in the midst of which they lived from the economic point of view. It is well understood that this social parasitism on the strictly economic level detracted not at all from the scope of the civilizing role, spiritual and cultural, of Buddhism, which could not be too highly praised. But from the beginning, this phenomenon had an important result which the canonical texts clearly recognize: the necessity for the monks not to settle in a determined geographical site, but to travel constantly, except at the time of the rains when any movement is impossible. Moreover, to the extent that the Community grew in numbers, it is quite evident that it could not subsist in one compact group <46> and hence its bursting apart into several groups, each consisting, through the force of circumstance, of a number strictly limited by the individuals capable of providing food for the begging-rounds of each village or small town met on the way.

All the towns were not large cities like Vaiśālī, Rājagṛha, Kauśāmbi or Kāśi, important commercial centers situated in the center of lands rich in rice or barley. They did not all contain within their walls whole populations full of fervor for Buddhism. They were not all residences of powerful kings like Bimbisāra or wealthy merchants like Anāthapiṇḍada, rich middle-class citizens like Viśākhā or well-off courtesans like Ambapāli, capable of giving to the Community complete vast parks and of supporting the assembly of

monks with copious meals for several days. Between two of these prosperous and friendly cities it was necessary to travel often more than a hundred kilometers and to encounter along the way nothing but poor hamlets, able to provide meager food for only a few monks who felt happy if rival sects or strict Brahmins did not oppose their provisioning of fresh supplies.

Thus it was soon necessary through the force of circumstance to arrive at a system of areas of canvassing according to which each group of monks had a territory in which it was accustomed to travel in search of subsistence, a territory vast enough and a group sufficiently small so that the source of food should not be too quickly dried up. This system, established gradually by custom and the needs of economic equilibrium, in no way prevented the monks who were going on pilgrimage or making long trips for any reason whatsoever from crossing through the areas of canvassing of other groups. Most frequently, these groups had their general quarters in a city or large town into which they withdrew to pass the rainy season sheltered from bad weather but also from famine, the community of donors being more numerous and consequently able to support the needs of the monastic group for a longer time. The stories of the second council completely confirm this geographical distribution[30] and its consequences from the point of view of the doctrine and the discipline, namely the appearance of regional particularities in these matters, as was the case especially among the monks of Vaiśālī. The recruiting of monks at the local level tended to introduce into the life and minds of each group special elements borrowed from the habits and customs, the folklore and spiritual traditions, of its region, elements differentiating it from other groups.

Although the geographical distribution, out of economic necessity, encouraged the appearance of local special features, seeds of the great divisions of the Community into sects and schools, relationships were, however, not broken between the different groups. In fact, pilgrim monks, emissaries and perhaps even inspectors, maintained the liaison. This is perhaps why the break-up by the schisms occurred but slowly in regard often to very secondary points, why, despite the differences, shared doctrinal directions were preserved in the whole of the Community, and why it was possible for a long time for the various schools to borrow from one another numerous doctrinal, disciplinary and literary elements and mutually to imitate one another.

Above all, it was the great pilgrimages to Magadha, the sacred land of Buddhism which contributed to maintaining relationships among the local communities. <47> The fashion of pilgrimage was always very strong in Buddhism and if strangers, Chinese, Kuchanese, Tibetans, Parthians, were not put off by the dangers and perils of long journeys across the mountains and deserts of central Asia or the southern oceans to go to visit the holy places of Buddhism and bring back written texts and oral teachings or even precious relics, how much more so the Indians themselves would undertake shorter and less dangerous pilgrimages within their own territory. The texts themselves insisted on the merits of making such a journey with a pious aim, not only to the places where the Buddha actually lived (Kapilavastu, Lumbinī, Bodh-Gayā, Vārāṇasī, Śrāvasti, Kauśāmbī, Kuśīnagara), but also even further, to the great shrines sheltering the relics

[30] Przyluski: *Le concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 307-303. – Hofinger: *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī,* p. 22-148, 183-196 and 253.

of the Master or his main disciples in Ceylon, Amarāvatī, or to Kashmir and Gandhāra. The Chinese pilgrims noted the importance of the pious crowds who accomplished these journeys. Better yet, epigraphy gives us numerous documents, inscriptions left at Sānchī, Amarāvatī, or Lumbinī by monks or laymen coming from the four corners of India. No doubt numbers of these pilgrims, gathered together by circumstance, discussed the Buddhist doctrine amongst themselves and came to face their differing opinions, reciprocally playing the part of informant.

Furthermore, the geographical distribution of the sects should not be exaggerated. If it is certain that some of them dominated more particularly in the regions where they had initially settled and where they then developed, it is certain that there would be found in the same region, in the same city, different sects, sometimes hostile, but more often living, so it would seem, in good terms.

On examining these doctrines, we will find that, in most cases, although the opinions diverge, the problems that they claim to resolve are the same. Without a doubt, some of them were able to arise simultaneously, from logical development, in different spiritual or regional centers without there having been any influences of communication between them. But there are too many of these problems and, although some find their origin in the old canonical texts common to different schools, there are many others that could not have belonged to the relatively restricted circle of intellectual and spiritual preoccupations of the earliest periods; such is, to cite only one but perhaps the most important of all, the problem of Buddhist ontology. All of this does seem to prove the existence of reciprocal influences and therefore communication, quite distant sometimes, between the sects. On the other hand, if the latter had a great area of extension, in order to ensure the doctrinal unity of each of them, it was necessary that the different residences maintained steady relations.

Finally, collections such as the *Kathāvatthu* and its commentary, the *Vibhāṣā*, the treatises of Vasimitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva, from the number and variety of information they contain, necessarily presuppose an important network of communication between the different schools, a network served by the pilgrims and the travelling monks.

It seems that it was Magadha, the great pilgrimage center that above all played the part of the focus of information. The stories of the Chinese pilgrims tell us that, on this sacred soil, monks of all the sects and all the regions could be encountered. Each regional community maintained, in the holy places of Buddhism, monasteries supported by rich donations and responsible for welcoming the appropriate pilgrims. The central geographic position of this area was able to facilitate <48> these pilgrimages. By contrast, it must have been much more rare for a monk from Kashmir to come to Ceylon, due to the length and difficulty of the journey on the one hand and the lesser interest of such a pilgrimage. Although each community soon blessed its domain by bringing in relics, constructing shrines and elaborating adequate legends, it is very probable that this sanctification generally had only a purely local value.

Now we must examine the nature of the relationships between communities of differing doctrines. It was agreed from the very beginning by all the sects that schism, one of the five major crimes along with

matricide, parricide, the murder of an Arhat and wounding the Buddha, led to immediate and unpardonable punishment. However, apart from some quickly extinguished local conflicts, it does not appear that this theory can be used between different sects. In India, no tradition makes the least allusion to conflicts between sects having ended up with the spilling of blood by the monks and, in the most serious cases, the punishment was banishment. Sometimes we come across the echo of brutalities due to sectarian princes or other authorities, but such facts are rare, if even the always overactive Indian imagination has not amplified them, and nothing indicates that they may have acted under the influence of particularly fanatic monks.

On the contrary, the examples of good feelings between monks of different sects are abundant. In Uḍḍiyāṇa, the Mahāsāṇghikas, Sarvāstivādins, Mahiśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas and Kāśyapīyas lived for centuries in true symbiosis, since texts of different origins sing the common praise of these five sects in the same words, each describing themselves by particular virtues. The profound doctrinal concord between sects of as differing stocks as the Mahāsāṇghikas, Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas and other Vibhajyavādins in the north-west of India is without a doubt the most convincing proof. It does seem that, in this case precisely, far from opposing these such diverse schools, geographic vicinity had the opposite effect of bringing them together. Similarly the strange influence the Mahāsānghikas and, it seems, the Sarvāstivādins also, had on the Haimavatas, or the doctrinal affinities between the Sammatīyas and the Andhakas in Deccan. We understand still more directly this spirit of mutual tolerance in the stories of the Chinese pilgrims who stayed, sometimes for a very long time, in communities belonging to sects differing strongly, without ever mentioning, even to the contrary, that they had to undergo the effects of sectarianism and intolerance. And this leads us to look more closely into the implicit reasons and manifestations of this spirit of mutual tolerance. Indeed, in the course of their long journeys, the pilgrims generally had few chances of sheltering each night in monasteries belonging to their own sect. As a result, if the sectarian spirit had prevailed, pilgrimages would have become impossible for all the sects. It was therefore necessary to respect the opinions and customs of others, by recognizing, as many works have it, that “one arrives at the same goal by diverse paths”.

The crises which, from time to time, erupted in the various communities, were provoked just as much by practices that could be regarded as scandalous for good reasons by different doctrinal opinions. It is not unlikely, as the traditions tell us and as could be expected *a priori*, that <49> suspect elements became introduced into such and such a community in order to benefit from the generosity of particularly generous and devoted princes or merchants and in order to live without worries. Scandals soon were aroused about such individuals due to their laziness, their love of luxury, their greed or even their lax morals. In these conditions, it was normal that the healthy part of the community reacted indignantly and sought to get rid of the corrupt individuals who were capable of bringing down the entire community. The story of the council of Vaiśālī, that of Mahadeva and that of Tissa Moggaliputta are very clear examples of the process by means of which the community reacted against the growing laxity of certain elements, even if it broke up

the Community itself. This phenomenon is not peculiar to Buddhism; the Reformation and Counter-reformation within Christianity, and Wahabism in Islam are well-known examples of this also.

Although we have insisted upon the sociological causes for the division of the Community into rival sects, we should not, however, neglect a cause, very important in an India so individualistic at the spiritual level, namely the influence of some teachers whose powerful personality, becoming established in a new doctrinal direction, led their disciples towards schism. The names of some of the sects have preserved the memory of them, Vātsiputrīya, Dharmagupta, Kāśyapa, and the traditions remember the role played by Mahādeva, Kātyāyanīputra, Maudgalyayana in the formation of the sects of the Mahāsāṇghikas, Sarvāstivādins and Vibhajyavādins. Here as elsewhere, sociological and personal factors are equally necessary for the production of the events. Insofar as any credit can be accorded to these stories, even in transposition, it can be affirmed that, if the schism conducted by Devadatta was aborted, it was that he did not respond to the social circumstances of the Community's life, at that time minimal and quite concentrated within a relatively narrow territory, and if the laxity of the Vaiśālī monks did not lead to a schism, it was, to the contrary, that they did not find amongst themselves a personality sufficiently powerful to lead them on the path of secession. The function of these guides seems to be simply to concentrate within themselves and then organize all these latent and implicit sociological, economic, geographical, etc., factors, and then to crystallize them and express the result in an action or a work. Without a doubt, that is exactly what constitutes genius and confers on it both novelty and power and for this the genius requires much intelligence, knowledge and daring.

Still other factors played a part in the division of the Community. Although Przyluski and Hofinger have insisted above all on the sociological and geographic causes that we have just examined, Dutt and Demiéville cling more particularly to strictly religious causes: "the system of specialization in the different branches of Buddhist literature"[31] and "the conflict between rigorism and laxity, between monasticism and laity, between 'holy' and 'profane' "[32]

Texts of all origins as well as the inscriptions found at Barhut, Sānchī, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, etc., give us abundant evidence on the first point by mentioning *dhammadharas, vinayadharas* <50> *mātikādharas, suttantikas, dhammakathikas*, *dīghabhāṇakas, majjhimabhāṇakas, saṃyuktāgaminas, ābhidharmikas*, etc., i.e., monks specializing in study and recitation of the *Sutras*, the *Vinaya*, the *matṛkās*, or portions of them. The reason for these divisions resides in the breadth of the Canon which could be learned by heart and completely remembered only by these very monks. The Canon must be preserved orally for it could not be communicated to certain classes of people. The monks who thus specialized were collected into groups

[31] Dutt: *op. cit*., vol. II, p. 14.
[32] Demiéville: *op. cit*., p. 159-160.

living in the same body of buildings in the monasteries and enjoyed privileges that varyied from one group to another. This resulted in a solidarity that often led to rivalry between groups to the great displeasure of the community to which they belonged, as is shown in stories in the Vinaya. Paramārtha goes even further since, in fragments preserved from his commentary on Vasumitra, he notes that the Gokulikas specialized in the Abhidharma, the Sautrāntikas in the Sūtras, the Sarvāstivādins in the Abhidharma, the Haimavatas in the Sūtras, the Sammatīyas in the Vinaya. Sometimes still more serious consequences resulted. Thus, according to Paramārtha, the Gokulikas were so well specialized in the study of the Abhidharma that they refused to preach, which would have made them 'waste' their time, and considered themselves free of any disciplinary obligations, adopting the career of the Bodhisattvas[33] conforming to the practices and teachings of the Mahāyāna.

This last fact allows us to pass on to the study of the second cause, the struggle between rigorism and laxity. Traces of this are found even in the stories of the life of the Buddha, like the story of Subadda who rejoiced in the death of the Buddha by saying that the Community was now freed of the strict discipline imposed on the Community by the Teacher. Also it was the laxity of the monks of Vaiśāli that brought about the meeting of the second council. Finally, comparative study of the *Vinayapiṭaka* reveals the laxist tendencies of some sects and the rigorist tendencies of some others. The Mahāsāṇghika schism, caused by the five propositions of Mahādeva, is also a good example of this conflict which, always latent in the bosom of the Community, sometimes exploded into grave crises. On the other hand, this last case shows to what degree the latter was mixed with the conflict that opposed monachism with laicism, for the victory of Mahādeva's propositions initiated the decline of the Arhant at the same time as it constituted a first success for laxism. Later, some northern sects maintained, to the great scandal of the austere Theravādins, that the layman could become Arhant, and, in order to appreciate properly the profound meaning of this thesis, we should remember that the Bodhisattva is usually a lay person. As Buddhism evolved, the rift increased more and more between the rigorist and aristocratic monasticism, mainly represented by the Ceylonese Theravādins, and the laxist and popular laicism which more and more characterized certain northern sects coming from the Mahāsāṇghikas Between these two extreme positions there was a whole range of nuances, linking in a fragile way the two sides of the abyss. The second tendency became weighted down little by little with new elements that conferred onto it a new nature. By getting closer to the lay people, the laxist sects were influenced by them and gradually substituted, in place of the Path by means of moral practices (*śīla*), the Path by way of faith (*śraddhā)*, by way of worship of the Buddha and ritual practices, which depend on <51> a whole mythology. The latter finds its sentimental and naïve expression in the *Jātakas*, the number of which, ever increasing, in some cases formed a special Basket, the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.[34]

The division of the Community into many sects is thus due to diverse and complex causes which today we are unable to discern clearly and which may have varied in the course of time. <55>

[33] Demiéville, *Origine des sectes*, p. 22, 23, 42, 53, 54, 56.
[34] This whole aspect of the evolution of Buddhism, in the sense of the decline of the Arhat and the popularization of Buddhism, has been described by Lamotte in talks given at the College de France in 1951.

SECOND SECTION

THE SECTS

CHAPTER I

The Mahāsāṇghikas

The Mahāsāṇghika sect arose following the first schism, about 140 E.N. or 340 B.C.E. Mahādeva, a monk renowned for his learning and virtue, maintained a group of five propositions according to which the Arhant could be seduced in dream, have doubts, have ignorance mainly in regard to his quality of Arhant, be led on the Path of deliverance by another, and pronounce the word "Suffering!" while in meditation. These five propositions were approved by some venerable and wise monks such as Nāga, Sthiramati and Prācya. The conflict provoked a councilwhich was gathered at Pāṭaliputra, capital of Magadha. The king of the country, probably one of the Nandas, who was asked to arbitrate, decided in favor of the most numerous group, in accordance, it seems, with the prescripts of the Buddha. The supporters of Mahādeva, being the more numerous, won their case and took the name of Mahāsāṇghika. Their opponents, who claimed to compensate for their inferiority in number by greater orthodoxy took the name of Sthavira.

From a comparative study of the stories of the councils of Rājagṛha and Vaiśālī in the various *Vinayas*, it seems that the Mahāsāṇghikas first had their main seat east of Magadha,[35] at an era that seems to be earlier than Aśoka, from the end of the 4th century to the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.E.

In the 2nd century C.E. inscriptions attest their presence in Mathurā, Karle and the Kabul region.[36]

At the beginning of the 5th century, Fa-hien found their *Vinayapiṭaka* and *Abhidharmapiṭaka* at Pātaliputra.[37]

At the beginning of the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang notes their presence in the west of Kashmir (1 monastery, 100 monks), in Andarab in the north of Afghanistan (3 monasteries, some dozens of monks), and that of their Vinaya, together with four others, in Uḍḍiyāṇa.[38]

At the end of the 7th century C.E., I-tsing gives a slightly more complete picture. Mahāsāṇghikas were to be found in Magadha and in the north and south of India. They were rejected in Ceylon. They were introduced slowly into the islands of the Sonde and had a few representatives at Chen-si.[39]

Their *Vinayapiṭaka* and the preface to the Chinese *Ekottarāgama* which is late and which <56> must belong to them, give some indications about their Canon. The latter consisted first of a *Vinayapiṭaka* in five parts, an *Abhidharmapiṭaka* and a *Sūtrapiṭaka* made up of five *Agamas: Dīrgha, Madhyama*, *Saṃyukta,*

Chapter I

[35] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 309 sq. – Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśālī*, p. 183-187.

[36] Sten Konow: C.I.I., vol. II, part I. *Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions*, p. 49 N and 170. – Hultzsch: *Ep. Ind*., vol. 1902-3, p. 65 and 72. *Ep. Ind*., vol. IX, 1907-8, p. 146N. – Sastri: *Ep. Ind*., vol. XIX, 1927-8, p. 69.

[37] Legge: *Record of buddhistic Kingdoms*, p. 98-99.

[38] Watters: *Yuan chwang's travels*, vol. I, p. 226 and 282; vol. II, p. 268.

[39] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. xxiii, p. 7-20.

Ekottara and *Kṣudraka*. But soon the *Kṣudrakāgama* was transformed into a fourth *piṭaka*, the *Saṃyuktapiṭaka*, which contained and "developed *(vaipulya*), the profound meaning of the Mahāyāna", which permits the understanding that, in the course of time, *Mahāyānasūtras* were placed in it, as Paramārtha claims.[40] According to Hiuan-tsang, a fifth *piṭaka* was added, the *Dhāranīpiṭaka*, [41] but undoubtedly much later.

Two late Sūtras, one of which belongs to them, *the Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*, gives evidence of the existence in the north-west borders of India, more exactly no doubt in Uḍḍiyāṇa, of a community in which five sects lived in perfect harmony: the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Sarvāstivādins, the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas and the Kāśyapīyas. According to these two works, the Mahāsāṇghikas were distinguished by their yellow robes and by the diligence with which they studied the Sūtras and developed correct principles from them.

According to later works, they had as their teacher the brahmana Kāśyapa and as their emblem a conch (*śaṇkhā)*, their robe was made of 23 to 27 strips of cloth and their language was Prākrit.[42] The names of the Mahāsāṇghikas ended in *–mitra, -gupta, -jñana, -garbha,*[43] but it does not seem that these preferences of onomastic order were exclusive. We may note that the *Mahāvastu* of the Lokottaravādins, one of the principal Mahāsāṇghika sects, is in quasi-Sanskrit and not in Prākrit. Lin Li-Kouang assumes that "These Mahāsāṇghikas of Prākrit language can only be the Mahāsāṇghikas of the Deccan; nothing prevents the supposition that, more or less, the Mahāsāṇghikas of Dhanyakaṭaka (Madras) dwelling in the realm of the mahārāṣṭrī, used this language as their sacred tongue",[44] and that the Mahāsāṇghikas of quasi-Sanskrit language are those of the north-west. It would not be unheard of that branches of one and the same school, separated geographically by more than 2000 km, would have used different idioms. I-tsing tells us that the Mahāsānghikas draped their under-robe in the manner of Indian women, bringing the right edge over the left side and holding it tight under the belt so as not to let it float out.[45] They received their food, not directly from hand to hand, but by having it set down in a specially designated place.[46]

On the evidence of some pointers, Lin Li-Kouang writes: "… we think that in the history of Buddhism, there were two different schools both known by the same name of Mahāsāṃghika: 1) the Mahāsāṃghikas proper, non-reformed, representing the old liberal and Mahayanist leaning of the school…, 2) the reformed Mahāsāṇghikas, of conservative leaning and strictly Hīnayānist, who claimed to have come from the Sthavira or Vātsīputrīya orthodoxy and who represented a kind of return to the Buddhism of the Lesser Vehicle."[47] This hypothesis is contradicted by the entire group of very valid traditions on the affiliation of

[40] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 211 and 217. – T.S. 1425, p. 489c-492c. – T.S. 125, verse preface. – Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 21, 41 and 43.
[41] Watters: *Yuan-chwang's travels*, II, p. 160-161.
[42] *Varṣāgraprcchā,* cited by Lin Li-Kouang: *Introduction,* p. 181. – Cf. *ibid*., p. 177 sq.
[43] *ibid.,* p. 178.
[44] *ibid*., p. 202-205 and especially p. 203-204.
[45] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. 66.
[46] *ibid*., p. 7.
[47] Lin Li Kouang: *Introduction,* p. 302 and also p. 190, 194 and 295-302.

<57> the sects[48] and it rests on a poor interpretation of the two texts. On the one hand, it is wrong that the beginning of the account of the schisms in the *Śāriputraparipṛcchasūtra* concerns a reform of the *Mahāsāṇghikavinaya*.[49] Indeed, the expression *ta-tchong, mahāsaṇgha*, designates the Great Community as it was before the first schism, the schism that separated the Mahāsāṇghikas and the Sthaviras. The four translations of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* of Vasumitra use the same expression, *ta-tchong* or *ta-seng* in Chinese, *dge-'dun phal chen* in Tibetan, to designate the Great Community (*mahāsaṇgha*) prior to any schism.[50] When, several lines later in the Sūtra, it is a question of the Mahāsāṇghikas, the name of the latter is not translated by *ta-tchong* but is transcribed as *mo-ho-seng-k'i*. On the other hand, the confusion made by the Chinese Seng-yeou between the Vātsiputrīyas and the Mahaṣāṇghikas[51] itself results in a confusion between the schisms that gave birth to one and the other sect. Furthermore, it is not extraordinary that the tendencies of the *Mahāsāṇghikavinaya* and those of the *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra* should be so different, when we can see that several centuries separated their respective writings.[52]

We possess some part of their Canon. Indeed, the Chinese translation of their *Vinayapiṭaka* has been preserved for us. Moreover, indications contained in the preface to the Chinese translation of the Ekottarāgama show that in all probability the version of the latter thus translated belonged to a Mahāsāṇghika sect. Finally, examination of the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra*, probably of Dharmaguptaka origin, shows that this treatise contains a large number of theses belonging to the Mahāsāṇghikas of the north and the south and disagrees with them only on a few secondary points. The absence of the Lokottaravādin doctrine and any ontological speculation leads to the assumption that this treatise is quite close to the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the original Mahāsāṇghikas and was established before these doctrines were elaborated.

Here are the theses attributed to them:[53]

1.The Buddhas are supramundane (*lokottara*).[54]

The body of the Buddhas is entirely supramundane for it is unsurpassable (*asamatikramaṇīya*) and completely pure (*anāsravamātra*). Even the body of the Saints (*aśaikṣa*) does not surpass the body of the Buddha; the body of the former being destructible, it is called mundane (*laukika*). Only the Buddhas leave

[48] See above, Part I, chap. I.
[49] Lin Li Kouang, p. 296. – T.S. 1465, p. 900b end.
[50] First phrase in prose after the stanzas of introduction.
[51] Lin Li Kouang, p. 297.
[52] For more details, see A. Bareau: *Une confusion entre Mahāsāṇghika et Vātsīputrīya*, J.A. 1953, p. 399-406.
[53] The numbering of the theses adopted here for the treatises of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinitadeva is that which appears in my [Bareau's] French translation of these three works which agrees roughly with that of the Japanese edition of Teramoto and Hiramatsu. Since the system is different in the works of Masuda and Walleser, it seemed possible for me [Bareau] to adopt one of my own which seems to be better adapted.
[54] Vasumitra, thesis 1. – Bhavya, theses I of the Ekavyāvaharikas. – Vinītadeva, thesis 1 of the Lokottaravādins. See kathāvatthu, XVIII, thesis attributed to the Vetullakas and II, 10, thesis attrinbuted to the Andhakas.

all beings below them for they are supreme (*anuttara*), indestructible and transcend any destructibility: this is why they are completely supramundane.[55]

2. The Tathāgathas are without impurities (*anāsrava*) or worldly (*laukika*) things

(*dharma*) .[56]

When they are in the body of the Buddhas, the eighteen elements (*dhātu*) are all called 'without impurities' because they are neither joined <58> to the impurities *(āsravasaṃprayukta*) nor linked with the impurities *(āsravasaṃbaddha*). The three types of activities (*karman*) which the Buddhas accomplish are also without impurities. This is why the Tathāgatas are completely without impure things.[57]

According to the *Vibhāṣā*, the Mahāsāghikas affirm that the birth-body of the Buddhas is without impurities for, although the Buddha was born (*jāta*) into the world (*loka*), although he became an adult (*saṃvṛddha*) in the world, he dwells (*viharati*) there only after having conquered (*abhibhūya*) the world and without being defiled (*anupalipta*) by the world.[58]

3. In all their words (*vācā),* the Tathāgathas turn the wheel of the Dharma

(*dharmacakraṃ pravartayanti*).[59]

The wheel of Dharma (*dharmacakra*) is not just the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*) that converts beings, but all the words pronounced by the Buddha, for there is not a single one that is not of use to beings. Here, one is calling 'wheel' (*cakra*) that which subdues, tames and turns. All the words of the Buddha subdue and tame other people and the ignorance (*ajñāna*), error (*moha*), etc… in them. Even the most innocuous words, such as: "Is it raining?", "How are you?" have a profound meaning destined to make beings enter onto the Path of deliverance.[60]

4. With a single sound (*śabda*) the Buddha enunciates all the elements of the Dharma (*dharmadhātu*).[61]

After having fully cultivated the practices for a long time, the Buddha is endowed with merit (*puṇya*) and inconceivable supernatural powers. With a single sound, by saying a single word, he is able to make all living beings hear his Dharma, and they understand it differently according to their natures, in order to drive out their own defilements (*kleśa*). By a single sound, he can announce the entire Dharma and

[55] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 12b-13a.
[56] *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 229a, 391c, 871c. See also *Kathāvatthu*, XVIII, 1. Vasumitra, thesis 2. – Bhavya, theses 2 and 5. – *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p 229a, 391c, 871c.

[58] Vasumitra, thesis 3. – Bhavya, thesis 3 (negation wrong). – Vinītadeva, thesis 7. – *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 912b.
[59] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 13b.
[60] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 14a-16a.
[61] Vasumitra, thesis 4.

consequently make all his listeners understand the coarse (*sthula*) or subtle (*sūkṣma*) meaning (*artha*) according to their particular type.[62]

5. In what the Bhagavant says, there is nothing that is not in keeping with the meaning (*yathārtha*). [63]

According to Kouei-ki, all the words pronounced by the Buddha benefit others, none of them are futile and without benefit to beings. Furthermore, everything that the Buddha says is completely free of fault, is rational and poses no difficulty. Everything that he says is without the four kinds of errors, which are: not being contrary to place, time, recipient or the Dharma, for all that he says is adapted to the circumstances of the place and the moment, to the auditors and to the teaching.[64]

The corresponding thesis in Bhavya is formulated in this way: the words of all the Tathagatas manifest (*abhimuñcanti*) their essence (*garbha*); and the thesis of the *Vibhāṣā* is formulated as*:* the words of the Dharma wheel (*dharmacakravācā)* have a self-nature (*svabhāva*).

6. The material body (*rūpakāya*) of the Tathāgatas is truly limitless (*ananta*).[65] <59>

Having cultivated merit during many cosmic eras (*kalpa*), the Buddha has obtained, as reward, a perfect body *(kāya*), the limitless Dharma element (*dharmadhātu*). The visible body of the Buddha, six feet in height, is not the true body of the Buddha but rather his magically emanated body (*nirmāṇakāya*) in which he appears to beings and which is adapted to the purpose of his teachings. Paramārtha says that the body of the Buddha is limitless in three ways: 1) It is limitless in measure. According to what is most suitable, he appears with a large or a small body. Being unable to say precisely that the size of the Buddha's body is great only, we say that it is limitless. 2) We say that it is limitless in number. As there are many beings during a given era, each one sees the Buddha according to how it is useful to him, and the Buddha is able to manifest in many bodies. Since the number of these bodies cannot be said precisely, we say that it is limitless. 3) It is limitless in causes. Since the things (*dharmas*) that make up the body of the Buddha are each produced by causes that are that many innumerable good roots (*kuśalamūla*), we say that it is limitless in causes.[66]

7. The power of the Tathāgatas is also limitless.[67]

The supernatural strengths that the Buddha possesses are called power, powerful virtue. In a single moment (*ekakṣaṇa*) he can exert his power everywhere, in all directions and in all the universes, without special intention.[68]

8. The longevity of the Buddhas is also limitless.[69]

---

[62] Kouei-ki, p. 16a.
[63] Vasumitra, thesis 5. – Bhavya, thesis 4. – *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 912b.
[64] K'ouei-ki, p. 16b-17a.
[65] Vasumitra, thesis 6. – Vinītadeva, thesis 3.
[66] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 17ab.
[67] Vasumitra, thesis 7.
[68] Kouei-ki, II, p. 18ab.

Since the body of retribution of the Buddha has been obtained by him as a result of his having cultivated merits for many infinite cosmic eras (*kalpa*), his life is truly endless and indestructible. It is for the benefit of living beings that he has cultivated the Path (*mārga*) for many cosmic eras and has received a limitless life. Since there are infinite different types of beings, the life of the Buddha must be equally infinite so that he can work for their benefit according to what is suitable for each.[70]

9. While converting living beings and making pure (*śuddha*) faith (*śraddhā*) arise in them, the Buddha has no thought of ever being satiated.[71]

Because the Buddha, with his mind of benefiting beings, is never surfeited, he does not enter into nirvāṇa. His compassion (*karuṇā)* is limitless, his longevity is infinite. If there are beings to whom it is suitable that the Buddha should manifest his miracles and the bliss of his quietude, he is born in the royal palace, etc., he accomplishes the Awakening (*bodhi*), he converts and guides these beings. If there are beings to whom it is suitable to manifest the stopping of causality, he fictitiously (*nirmāṇa*) enters into nirvaṇa. Since his mind is not surfeited, he abides in the form of a body of enjoyment (*saṃbhogakāya*) and, until the end of time, he creates (*nirmāti*) forms adapted to the different types of beings and teaches by means of skillful means (*upāya*). [72]

10. The Buddha neither sleeps nor dreams.[73]

In sleep, the mind (*citta*) is obscured and completely reduced to the state of lack of concentration. In the Buddhas, there is no mind that is not concentrated (*samāpanna*) which is why they do not have any sleep <60> (*svapna*). Dream being produced by intention (*cetanā),* concepts (*saṃjñā*), desires (*kāma*), etc…, and the Buddhas being without all of that, they no longer have any dreams.[74]

11. The Tathāgatas answer questions without reflecting.[75]

In the Buddhas, there is no preparation (*prayoga*), they do not reflect (*cintayanti*) on words, phrases, etc…. in order to preach to others, but they are able to respond spontaneously.[76]

12. The Buddhas never pronounce a single word, for they are eternally resting in contemplation (*samādhi*), but beings, thinking that they have spoken words, leap with joy.[77]

The Buddhas explain the Dhrma spontaneously, without needing to reflect on the words, phrases, etc…., because they are constantly in contemplation. In the Buddhas, the words, phrases, etc… form by themselves to pronounce the Dharma conforming to the Truth.[78]

---

[69] Vasumitra, thesis 8. – Vinītadeva, thesis 3.
[70] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 18b-19a.
[71] Vasumitra, thesis 9.
[72] K'ouei-ki, II, p.19ab.
[73] Vasumitra, thesis 10.
[74] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 20a.
[75] Vasumitra, thesis 11.
[76] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 20b.
[77] Vasumitra, thesis 12. – Vinītadeva, thesis 4. – *Kathāvatthu*, XVIII, 2, thesis of the Vetullakas.

13. By a mind of a single instant (*ekakṣaṇika*), they understand all things (*dharma*).[79]

Having cultivated their mind (*citta*) for numerous cosmic eras (*kalpa*), the Buddhas alone, by means of a mind of a single instant, are able to understand at once all things, i.e., the different aspects of all things and their self-nature.[80]

14. By means of wisdom (*prajnā*) associated with (*saṃprayukta*) with the mind of a single moment (*ekakṣaṇikacitta*), they cognize all things (*dharma*).[81]

Their wisdom associated with the mind of a single moment is able to cognize that all things are completed destroyed (*kṣīna*), for this wisdom is perfected. When they arrive at the Path of liberation (*vimuktimārga*), in the space of the single mental state (*smṛti*) that immediately follows the Diamond Path (*vajramārga*), they are able to cognize the self-nature (*svabhāva*) of all things. Thus they have no more need of a mental series (*santati*) to know that everything is destroyed, for they know completely the self-nature of wisdom.[82]

15. In the Buddha Bhagavats, the knowledge of destruction (*kṣayajñana*) and the knowledge of non-production (*anutpādajñana*) continue ceaselessly until they enter parinirvāṇa.[83]

The eighteen elements (*dhātu*) that make up the person of the Buddhas are entirely without impurities (*anāsrava*). Thus the knowledges lacking impurities (*anāsravajñana*) are present constantly from moment to moment until parinirvāṇa. There are two knowldges (*jñana*), the *kṣayajñana* and the *anutpādajñana*, that are thus *anāsrava*. At all times, these two activities of the same substance, wisdom (*prājña*), function together continuosly.[84]

16. The Buddhas abide (*tiṭṭhanti*) in every (*sabbā)* direction (*disā*).[85] <61>

There are Buddhas in the four directions, below (*heṭṭhā)* above (*upari*), in all the universes (*sabbalokadhātu*), in community with the universes (*lokadhātusannivāsaṃ)* everywhere (*samantato*).

17. The Buddhas exist as substance (*dravya*).[86]

No proof of this thesis is mentioned.

18. When the Bodhisattvas enter (*avakrāmanti*) into a womb (*garbha*), they do not take on the embryonic forms of *kalala, arbuda, peśi* and *ghana* as their own substance (*svabhava*).[87]

---

[78] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 21a.
[79] Vasumitra, thesis 13. – Vinītadeva, thesis 5. – *Kathāvatthu*, V, 9, thesis of the Andhakas.
[80] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 22a.
[81] Vasumitra, thesis 14. – Vinītadeva, thesis 5.
[82] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 22b-23a.
[83] Vasumitra, thesis 15. – Vunītadeva, thesis 6.
[84] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 23ab.
[85] *Kathāvatthu*, XXI, 6. – Vinītadeva, thesis 27.
[86] Vinītadeva, thesis 2.
[87] Vasumitra, thesis 16. – Bhavya, thesis 6. – Vinītadeva, thesis 9. – *Kathāvatthu*, XIV, 2, thesis of the Pubbaseliyas and the Aparaseliyas.

When the Bodhisattvas enter into the embryo, they have nothing impure, and this is why they do not go through the gradual development of impure forms. Thet enter into the embryo completely endowed with organs (*indriya*) and the great elements (*mahābhūta*). Being completely perfect, they come at once to the embryonic stage of *paraśākhā,* i.e., the embryo endowed with all its limbs. In the Bodhisattvas, there is a substance (*rūpa*) derived (*upādayā)* from the great elements which is pure and which permits the organs to develop suddenly to become their own substance. Since they have no need of impure substances, like sperm, they do not develop gradually like other beings. It is a question here only of the Bodhisattvas who have arrived at their last existence.[88]

19. When they enter into a womb (*garbha*), the Bodhisattvas take the form of a white elephant.[89]

As the Mahāsāṇghikas deny the intermediary existence (*antarābhava*), this form of the white elephant is a fictitious body (*nirmita*) and not an *antarābhava* body. This form is symbolic, for the Bodhisattva is both very powerful and very gentle.[90]

20. When they come out of the womb, the Bodhisattvas are born from the right side.[91]

The Bodhisattvas are born from the side, located in the middle of the body, in order to symbolize the middle path that they are going to preach. They save their mothers from the sufferings of gestation and parturition.[92]

21. The Bodhisattvas do not produce the notion of lust (*kāmasaṃjñā)* or the notion of malicious intent (*vyāpādasaṃjñā)* or the notion of harmfulness (*vihimsāsaṃjñā).*[93]

On entering into the second incalculable period (*asaṃkhyeyakalpa*) of the Bodhisattva's career, one becomes noble (*arya*) and from this moment until the end of a hundred cosmic eras (*kalpa*), one no longer produces these three kinds of notions (*saṃjña*), all the more reason not in the following periods.[94]

22. Because they want to perfect (*paripapācayisānti*) beings (*sattva*), the Bodhisattvas make the vow (*praṇidhāna*) to be reborn in the bad destinies (*durgati*) where they can dwell by their own free will (*īśvarīyakāma*).[95]

The Bodhisattvas are reborn in the bad destinies in order to: 1) decrease the suffering (*duḥkha*) of beings by means of the joy that the presence of the Bodhisattvas cause them; <62> 2) increase their own mind of disgust for the world, for suffering increases disgust; 3) accomplish universal salvation by arousing good thoughts in beings; 4) train in patience (*kṣānti*) and suffering and thus increase their great compassion (*mahākaruṇā)*. There are three stages in the career of the Bodhisattvas: 1) indeterminate, during the first

[88] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 24b-25b.
[89] Vasumitra, thesis 17. – Bhavya, thesis 7.
[90] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 25b-26a.
[91] Vasumitra, thesis 18. – Bhavya, thesis 7.
[92] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 26b-27a.
[93] Vasumitra, thesis 19. – Bhavya, thesis 8. – Vinītedeva, thesis 8.
[94] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 27b.
[95] Vasumitra, thesis 20. – Bhavya, thesis 9. – Kathāvatthu, XXIII, 3 thesis of the Anbhakas.

incalculable era (*asaṃkhyeyakalpa*); 2) determinate, during the second incalculable era; 3) receiving the prophecy, during the third incalculable era. It is only in these last two stages that the Bodhisattva can be reborn at will in the bad destinies.[96]

23. By the knowledge (*jñana*) consecutive (*antika*) to the higher realization (*abhisamaya*) of a moment (*ekakṣaṇika*), one cognizes in full the different aspects *(ākāra*) of the four Truths (*satya*).[97]

They base their opinion on the Sutras. One Sūtra says: "If there are no doubts in regard to the Truth of suffering, the Truths of the origin, cessation and the Path, there are no longer any doubts." Another Sūtra teaches: "O monks, at the moment when the dust-free (*viraja*) and stainless (*vītamala*) eye of Dharma (*dhammacakkhu*) is produced in the noble listener (*ariyasāvaka*), everything that is (*yaṃkiñci*) the Dharma of the origin (*samudayadhamma*) is entirely (*sabbantaṃ)* the Dharma of cessation (*nirodhadhamma*)." Since when one clearly sees the truths, one sees their general characteristics and not their specific characteristics, the clear understanding must have taken place at one single time. In the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*), one sees the general characteristics of the Truths, emptiness (*śūnyatā)* and non-self (*anātmiya*). When one sees emptiness and non-self, one then sees the four Truths completely. If one examines separately the specific characteristics of each of the four Truths in the Path of cultivation (*bhāvanamārga*), when one sees the Truth of suffering, one can understand the other three Truths, in the same way that a single mental consciousness (*manovijñana*), having as object *(ālambana*) both the five aggregates (*skandha*) and the ten kinds of form *(rūpa*), is able to cognize them distinctly. At the later limit of the Path of seeing, a consciousness (*jñāna*) is produced that in a single moment (*ekakṣaṇa*) is able to cognize all the distinctive characteristics of the four Truths. In the Path of seeing, although one can also cognize the four Truths in a single instant, one can only cognize them as a whole, but one cannot yet cognize them distinctively.

24. The five or six sense consciousnesses (*vijñānadhātu*) of the eye, etc., are each endowed both with passions (*sarāga*) and without passions (*virāga*). [98]

25. In the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*) and the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*), the six consciousnesses (*vijñana*) exist together.[99]

In the three realms (*dhatu*) there is a subtle (*sūkṣma*) form (*rūpa*) that constitutes the five sense faculties (*indriya*) and the four great elements (*mahābhūta*). Consequently, the possibility exists of experiencing the latter by means of the former, which results in the existence of the sense consciousnesses.

---

[96] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 28ab.
[97] Vasumitra, thesis 21. – Bhavya, thesis 10. – Vinītadeva, thesis 10. T.S. 1545, p. 405ab and 533 a. – L.V.P.: *Kośa*, V, p. 185, n. 2 and 5. – K'ouei-ki, II, p. 29 ab, III, p. 31a.
[98] Vasumitra, thesis 22. – Bhavya, thesis 11. – Vinītadeva, thesis 11. – *Kathāvatthu*, X, 3 and 4, theses of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[99] Vasumitra, thesis 23. – Vinītadeva, thesis 12. – *Kathāvatthu*, VIII, 7 and 8 and XVI, 9, theses of the Andhakas.

26. The five sense faculties (*indriya*) consist of lumps of flesh (*maṃsapeśī*). The eye (*cakṣus*) does not see forms (*rūpa*), the ear (*śrotra)* <63> dos not hear sounds (*śabda*), the nose (*ghrāna*) does not smell odors (*gandha*), the tongue (*jihva*) does not taste flavors (*rasa*), the body (*kāya*) does not perceive tangibles (*spraṣṭavya*).[100]

Our sources disagree completely on the Mahāsāṇghika position concerning this question.

It is said in a Sūtra that the eye is formed from material (*rūpa*) derived (*upādāya*) from the great elements (*mahābhūta*) just like the other four sense organs and that each of them has solidity, hardness, as nature, and belongs to the solid and hard type of things. Being only lumps of flesh formed from impure material, the sense organs cannot see, hear, etc…. Only the sense consciousnesses (*vijñana*) can see, hear, etc…

According to Bhavya and the Kathāvatthu, the Mahāsāṇghikas maintained the opposite thesis. They depended therefore on a Sūtra: "O monks, the monk sees with the eye, hears with the ear…"

27. When one is in the state of contemplation (*samāhitāvasthā),* there is vocal communicaion (*vacibheda*), disciplined (*saṃvṛta*) mind (*citta*) and attention (*manasikāra*) to discussion.[101]

The mind of the person who is in the state of contemplation does not objectify the objects (*viṣaya*) of contemplation (*samādhi*), but within the concentrated mind (*ekacittatva*) there are many objects *(ālambana*) such as vocal action (*vākkarman*) that allows vocal communication. When one is not yet in the concentration of seeing (*darṣana*), the first stage of contemplation, one can produce physical action (*kāyakarman*) since, the body (*kāya*) being the support *(āśraya*) of contemplation, when this support moves, the mind follows this movement and then, when it ought to stay stable (*sthita*), it is scattered (*vikṣipta*). The disciplined mind is the mind that objectifies the object of contemplation. Since this mind is manageable, it is called disciplined. This shows that there may be vocal communication during contemplation, but then the mind is not called stable; it is a scattered mind. At this moment, one can produce a vocal action. Within the mind of contemplation, there is also attention to discussion but, since its objects are scattered, this mind is rebellious and is no longer very manageable or disciplined; this is why it is said that there is discussion. Discussion is the name given to a variety of errors. The mind that objectifies scattered objects is called attention to discussion. In it, mental (*manas*) activity manifests. In the concentrated mind, there is vocal communication. A single mind can thus have two objects. At the moment of the preparatory (*prayoga*) stage of contemplation, the mind objectifies only the objects of contemplation, but then, when the stage of contemplation lasts for a long time, the mind objectifies other objects without abandoning the original ones. Although it has scattered objects, it is still called a concentrated mind. However, these words and these discussions that appear in the concentrated mind do not allow the defiled

[100] Vasumitra, thesis 24. – Vinītadeva, thesis 13. – Bhavya, thesis 12, says the opposite. – *Kathāvatthu*, XVIII, 9, thesis of the Mahāsāṇghikas, also says the opposite.
[101] Vasumitra, thesis 25. – Bhavya, thesis 14. – Vinītadeva, thesis 14. – *Kathāvatthu*, II, 5 and XVIII, 8, thesis of the Pubbaseliyas.

consciousness (*kliṣṭavijñana*) to be produced, for that would be a contradiction between this defiled mind and the purity of the contemplation.[102]

28. That which had to be done (*karaṇīya*) being accomplished (*kṛta*), there are no more reasons[103] (*sthāna*).[104] <64>

For the *aśaikṣas*, i.e., the Arhants, there is no more continuance (Fr. *raisons*), for they no longer take objects in their differentiated aspects. When they take objects, they cognize only the objects which causality (*hetupratyaya*) has caused to arise. No more things to receive means that one does not seize the meanings (*artha*) of things strongly, that one is not attached to them. The old tradition says: lacking two reasons (*sthāna*) (Fr., *raisons*): 1) reason of attachment such as matter (*rūpa*) or mind (*citta*); 2) reason of rebirth. The first is cause (*hetu*), the second is fruit (*phala*).[105]

29. The Stream-enterers (*srotāpanna*) are able to understand the self-nature (*svabhāva*) of their mind and their mental events (*caitta dharma*).[106]

The Srotāpannas themselves know that they have obtained the fruit (*phala*) of Srotāpanna, they do not need anyone else to tell them. Others say that this may be understood thus: the mind and mental events, in one single instant, are able to cognize their self-nature. Among ordinary people (*pṛthagjana*) and among those who possess the other three fruits, it is thus.[107]

30. There are Arhants who are won over by others (*paropahṛta*), who are subject to ignorance (*ajñāna*), who have doubts (*kaṇkṣā*), who are saved by another (*paravitīrṇa*) and who speak words (*vacibheda*) when they are on the Path (*mārga*)[108]

The Arhants can be won over by another, i.e., they can have emission (*visṛṣṭi*) of sperm (*śukla*) during sleep, emission accompanied by erotic dreams which they attribute to deities (*devatā)* of demonic shape (*mārakāyika*) taking on female forms. The Arhant is not responsible for this for, under these circumstances, he is not playing an active part (*na paṭikkhipati*) but just a passive part since these are demonic deities seen in a dream who are acting alone (*aññesampi sukkaṃ gahetvā)* without his having any guilty intention (*byavasāya*) on his side. If, on the oither hand, the material impurity of the event is brought up and judged incompatible with the nature of an Arhant, one can reply that the body of the Arhant emits many other impure liquids, such as saliva, tears, urine, etc…., without anyone troubling about it. Furthermore, other (*pare*) people can take away (*upasaṃhareyyuṃ)* the Arhant's robe (*cīvara*), his food (*piṇḍapāta*), his bed

---

[102] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 32b-33b.
[103] *raison* (Fr.): *raison de vivre* : reason for living - *Sthāna* (Sanskrit) Monier Willimas gives continuance, continued existence, condition, place, state.
[104] Vasumitra, thesis 26.
[105] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 34ab.
[106] Vasumitra, thesis 27. – *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 42c.
[107] K'ouei-ki, p. 34b-35a.
[108] Vasumitra, thesis 28. – Bhavya, theses 13 and 15. – Vinītadeva, thesis 16. – *Kathāvathu*, II, 1,2,3,4,5 theses of the Pubbaseliyas.

(*sena*), his seat *(āsana*), etc…., without anybody thinking of blaming him. Consequently, the demons can indeed take away his sperm.

The Arhants still have ignorance (*ajñāna*), but this should not be confused with not-knowing (*avidyā),* the first member of the chain of conditioned production (*pratītyasamutpāda*). One accepts without any difficulty that the Arhant cannot always know (*na jāneyya*) the family (*nāmagotta*) of men (*purisa*) and women (*itthī*), or what is the good or the bad path (*maggāmagga*), or what is the name of the major trees of the forests (*vanappati*), the woods (*kaṭṭha*) and the plants (*tiṇa*). Consequently, ignorance still exists in the Arhant, but this is a pure ignorance distinct from not-knowing which is always impure.

Th Arhant has doubts. One easily accepts that he can have doubts (*kaṇkheyya*) in regard to the family of men and women, the good and bad paths, the names of trees, woods and plants. Consequently, the Arhant still has doubts, in particular about what is possible (*sthāṇa*) <65> and what is impossible, but he has definitively abandoned uncertainty (*saṃsaya*), which has the nature (*bhāva*) of the latent tendencies (*anusaya*).

The Arhants are instructed by others. It is easily accepted that it is others (*pare*) who show (*pakāsanti*), who explain *(ācikkhanti*) to the Arhant the families of men and women, the good and bad paths, the names of trees, woods and plants. Consequently, the Arhant is instructed by others and can owe his salvation to another. Śāriputra and Maudgalyayana became aware of their Arhant nature only through the intermediary of a proclamation (*vyākāraṇa*) by the Buddha.

Words can be emitted when one enters into possession of the Path. At the moment when he enters into the Path of Stream-entry (*sotāpattimaggākkhaṇe*), the person who enters into possession of the first preparatory trance (*patthamajjhāna*) exclaims: “O suffering!” (*dukkhanti*). Indeed, the first trance is accompanied by invertigation (*vitakka*) and analysis (*vicāra*). Now the Buddha himself said that investigation and analysis are the determining conditions for speech (*vacisaṇkhāra*) The entry into the Path, which is produced in the first trance, is therefore accompanied by investigation and analysis and, as a result, by vocal emission. Elsewhere the Buddha said that speech has its beginning in investigation (*vitakkasamuṭṭhāna*) which confirms the thesis. The Buddha also said that sound (*saddha*) is a thorn (*kaṇṭaka*) for the person who has entered into possession of the first trance. He himself related that a listener (*sāvaka*) of the former Buddha Sikhī called Abhibhū, dwelling in the Brahmaloka, informed (*viññāpesi*) a thousand worlds (*sahassīlokadhātu*) with this excalamation (*sara*): “Make the effort *(ārabbhtha*), try (*nikkamatha*), train yourselves (*yuñjatha*) in the teaching (*sāsana*) of the Buddha! Shake off (*dhunātha*) the army (*sena*) of Death (*maccu*) like an elephant (*kuñjara*) shakes a reed hut (*naḷāgāra*)! He who will dwell (*vihessati*) wakeful (*appamatta*) here below (*imasmiṃ*), in the discipline of the Dharma (*dhammavinaya*), having abandoned (*pahāya*) the cycle of rebirths (*jātisaṃsāra*), will put an end to suffering.” The exclamation: “O suffering!” can also be considered as a skillful means destined to bring forth the appearance of the Path.

31. To say "O suffering (*duḥkha*) is able to lead to the Path (*mārga*).[109]

The exclamation: "O suffering!" can lead instantly to the Path, and also to the Path of cultivation (*bhāvanamārga*) as well as to the initial stage of the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*).[110]

32. To say "O suffering!" can be an aid (*upakāra*).[111]

Frequently saying "O suffering" causes disgust for the world (*loka*) and also helps to accomplish the noble Path *(āryamārga*).[112]

33. Wisdom (*prajñā)* is a method that can make suffering (*duḥkha*) cease (*niruṇadhi*) and that can also prepare (*pariṣkṛṇoti*) for happiness (*sukha*).[113]

Discipline (*śīla*) and contemplation (*samādhi*) cannot be the means to make suffering cease and to prepare for the acquiring of nirvāṇa which is the supreme fruit (*phala*) of awakening (*bodhi*). Wisdom alone is capable of attaining such results.[114] This predominance of wisdom relates this thesis to <66> the doctrine of the *Prajñāpāramtāsūtras* and seems thus also to confirm the information transmitted by Paramārtha according to which the Mahāsāṇghikas introduced these sutras into their Canon.

34. Suffering (*duḥkha*) is also a nutrient *(āhāra*). [115]

According to K'ouei-ki, in the hells (*niraya*) the beings are given lumps of red-hot iron and keep alive because, for them; suffering is nutrient. According to the *Kathāvatthu* and Buddhaghosa, suffering brings (*dharati*) the awareness (*ñāṇa*) of suffering to the person who pronounces (*bhāsanto*) the words (*vāca*): "O suffering!" and he who utters this exclamation cultivates the Path (*magga*) by this very fact.

35. On the eighth groiund (*bhūmi*) one can dwell for a long time.[116]

The eighth ground is the first stage of the Path of salvation, that of the aspirant to the fruit of Stream entry (*srotāpannaphala*). Since the Sūtras testify that the individual who has arrived at this stage receives alms-food, he is thus able to come out of the contemplation of initial Path of seeing (*darṣanamārga*) and remain for a long time in this stage. Nevertheless, this state does not last for numerous existences, the complete stage of Srotāpanna not lasting longer than seven lifetimes.[117]

36. Until one has arrived at the element of earth of the lineage (*gotrabhūmidharma*), there is falling back (*parihāṇi*) everywhere.[118]

---

[109] Vasumitra, thesis 29. - See the preceding.
[110] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 35b.
[111] Vasumitra, thesis 30. – *Kathāvatthu*, XI, 4, thesis of the Anndhakas.
[112] K'ouri-ki, II, p. 36a.
[113] Vasumitra, thesis 31.
[114] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 36ab.
[115] Vasumitra, thesis 32. – *Kathāvatthu*, II, 6, thesis of the Pubbaseliyas.
[116] Vasumitra, thesis 33a. – Vinītadeva, thesis 18.
[117] K'ouei-ki, II, pp. 37a-38a.
[118] Vasumitra, thesis 33b. – Vinītadeva, thesis 19.

The *gotrabhūmidharma* is made up of the supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*), i.e., the four stages of penetration (*nirvedhabhāgīya*) that permit the acquiring of the first fruit (*phala*). From the first decision (*cittotpada*) to arrive at deliverance up to the *laukikāgradharmas*, there is falling back everywhere because the *laukikāgradharmas* consist of a series (*saṃtana*) of many mental states (*smṛti*). There is falling back since one has not yet reached the stable acquisition of the first fruit, that of Srotāpanna.[119]

37. The Stream enterer (*srotāpanna*) can have elements of falling back (*parihāṇidharma*) but the Arhant does not have elements of falling back.[120]

When one has attained the state of Srotāpanna, having abandoned the defilements by means of a single seeing (*darśana*) but not yet by cultivating (*bhavanā),* i.e., by means of frequemtly repeated practice, one still has delusion (*moha*) and, as a result, not yet being firmly established on the Path of deliverance, one can fall to a lower state. For the converse reasons, the Arhant cannot have elements of falling back.

38. There is no worldy *(laukika*) right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*) or worldly faculties of faith (*śraddhendriya*).[121]

There is, indeed, faith, energy, memory, contemplation and wisdom that are worldly for they concern ordinary people, but they cannot be identified with the five factors that are factors of progression on the Path of deliverance. Worldly faith, energy, etc., are not strong; <67> they change and do not increase, and this is why they cannot be called master-faculties (*indriya).* Only the pure (*anāsrava*) wisdom that allows delusion (*moha*) to be abandoned and cessation to be experienced, the pure faith which, being practiced in regard to virtue (*śīla*) and the Three Jewels (*triratna*), allows the experiencing of purity are called master-faculties because they serve to eliminate the passions.

39. There are no indeterminate (*avyākṛta*) dharmas.[122]

Actions (*karman*) are good (*kuśala*) or bad (*akuṣala*) according to their objects (*viṣaya*). The result of a good action is good, that of a bad action is bad; the two are distinct essentially and there are no indeterminate things, i.e., good or bad.[123]

40. When one enters into the certainty of the acquisition of the absolute good (*samyaktvaniyāma*), one can say that one has abandoned (*prahīna*) all the fetters (*saṃyojana*).[124]

The fetters are of the same nature as the afflictions (*kleśa*). When one has entered into the noble Path of salvation, there are no more afflictions or troubles and this is why it is said that, when one has entered into the initial Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*), one has abandoned all the fetters.[125]

---

[119] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 38ab.
[120] Vasumitra, thesis 34. – Vinī9tadeva, thesis 20. – Vibhāṣā, T.S. 1545, p. 931b-933c : The Srotāpanna has falling back. – Kathāvatthu, II, 3, opposite thesis among some Mahāsāṇghikas according to which the Arhant does have elements of falling back.
[121] Vasumitra, thesis 35. – Bhavya, thesis 17. – Vinītadeva, thesis 22. – T.S. 1545, p. 559b, 567c.
[122] Vasumitra, thesis 36. – Vinītadeva, thesis 23 (?).
[123] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 42b.
[124] Vasumitra, thesis 37. – Bhavya, thesis 16.

41. The Stream-enterers (*srotāpanna*) may commit all the wrong-doings (*pāpa*) except for the unpardonable *(ānantarya*) crimes.[126]

The Srotāpanna may commit the ten bad actions, i.e., the ten breaches of discipline imposed on the monks, but they cannot commit the five unpardoinable crimes which are too serious. It is, therefore, difficult to distinguish a worldly person (*pṛthagjana*) from a noble person (*arya*), i.e., a Buddhist. How can the person who has obtained the initial fruit (*phala*) of Srotāpanna commit the ten bad actions without destroying his faith (*śraddhā)*? By contemplating the Truths (*satya*), he is purified but if, on coming out of his contemplation, he commits a wrong-doing, then it is not a contradiction.[127]

42. All the Sūtras spoken by the Buddha have a completely intelligible meaning (*nitārtha*).[128]

All the words spoken by the Buddha, being the setting into motion of the Wheel of the Dharma (*dharmacakrapravartana*), therefore represent the correct Dharma and consequently are intelligible in meaning.[129]

43. There are nine kinds of conditioned (*asaṃskṛta*) dharmas: 1) cessation due to discriminative wisdom (*pratisamkhyanirodha*), 2) cessation without discriminative wisdom (*apratisamkhyanirodh*a, 3) space *(ākāśa*). 4) the realm of the infinity of space *(ākāśantyāyatana*), 5) the realm of infinity of consciousness (*vijñānāntyāyatana*), 6) the realm of nothing at all *(ākiñcanyāyatana*), 7) the realm of neither with perception nor without perception (*nevasaṃjñānāsaṃjñayatana*), 8) the self-nature of the members of conditioned production (*pratītyasamutpādāgaṇgasvabhāva*), 9) the self-nature of the factors of the Path (*mārgāṇgasvabhāva*).[130]

<44> The self-nature of the mind (*cittasvabhāva*) is originally pure <68> (*prabhāsvara*). It is the adventitious impurities *(āgantukopakleśa*) that defile it.[131]

The self substance of the mind is eternally pure. It is because afflictions (*kleśa*) are produced which soil it that it is said to be defiled. But these defilements, not being of the original nature of the mind, are called adventitious.[132]

45. The latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are neither mind (*citta*) nor mental events (*caitta*) and are without object (*anālambana*).[133]

---

[125] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 41a. - *Supplément*, p. 225a.
[126] Vasumitra, thesis 38. – Vinītadeva, thesis 21.
[127] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 41b. – *Supplément*, p. 225a.
[128] Vasumitra, thesis 39. – Vinītadeva, thesis 23 (?)
[129] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 42a. – *Supplément*, p. 225b.
[130] Vasumitra, thesis 40. Vinītadeva, thesis 25.
[131] Vasumitra, thesis 41. – Bhavya, thesis 18. – Vinītadeva, thesis 32. – *Kathāvatthu*, III, 3, thesis of the Andhakas.
[132] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 45a. – T.S. 1548, p. 697b.
[133] Vasumitra, thesis 42. – *Kathāvatthu*, IX, 4, thesis of the Andhakas.

The tendencies exist only in the body (*kāya*) for, if they existed in the mind, when the latter disappears, they would disappear along with it and the worldly person would then be a noble person *(ārya*). Moreover, as they are neither mind nor mental events, they are without object.

46. The latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are different from the manifestly active afflictions (outbursts) (*paryavasthāna*), and the manifestly active afflictions are different from the tendencies for it must be said that the tendencies are dissociated from the mind (*cittaprayukta*) whereas the manifestly active afflictions are associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).[134]

The tendencies are different essentially from the manifestly active afflictions for they are the seeds (*bīja*) from which the latter arise. The tendencies are dissociated from the mind since the worldly person (*puthujjana*) who abides (*vattamāna*) with a good or indeterminate (*kusalābyākata*) mind (*citta*) is endowed with tendencies (*sānusaya*). Now these tendencies cannot be said to be associated with such a mind.

47. The past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) do not exist really.[135]

48. The realm of mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*) is neither cognizable (*jñeya*) nor perceptible to the consciousness (*vijñeya*), but it is comprehensible (*prajñeya*).[136]

The realm of mental phenomena is that which is revealed directly to the mind (*manas*). It is not that which the ordinary drifting mind (*samvṛtijñāna*) can know nor that which the impure (*sāsrava*) scattered consciousness can perceive. It is that which is penetrated by those who possess the six superknowledges (*abhijña*) and by those who see the principles of the Truth. Its nature is extremely subtle (*sūkṣma*) and escapes coarse means of consciousness.

49. There is no intermediate existence (*antarābhava*).[137]

This concerns the existence intermediate between the moment of death and that of rebirth. The Mahāsāṇghika argument on this point is unknown.

50. The Stream-enterers (*srotāpanna*) also acquire the trances (*dhyāna*).[138]

Since they enter into the preparatory path (*prayogamārga*) lacking impurities (*anāsrava*) and they can abandon the fetters (*saṃyojana*), they are able to subdue the afflictions (*kleśa*) and obtain the trances as a result. If they were unable to abandon the fetters, they could not acquire the fruit (*phala*) of Srotāpanna.[139] <69>

51. There is matter (*rūpa*) even in the mind (*citta*).[140]

---

[134] Vasumitra, thesis 43. – Bhavya, theisis 19. – Vinītadeva, thesis 33. – *Kathāvatthu*, XI, 1, thesis of the Mahāsaṇghikas, and XIV, 5 and 6, thesis of the Andhakas. T.S. 1548, p. 690b.
[135] Vasumitra, thesis 44. – Bhavya, thesis 20.
[136] Vasumitra, thesis 45. – Vinītadeva, thesis 36.
[137] Vasumitra, thesis 46. – Vinītadeva, thesis 34. -
[138] Vasumitra, thesis 47. Bhavya, Thesis 21. – Vinītadeva, thesis 35.
[139] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 48a.
[140] Vimītadeva, thesis 15. – See above thesis 25?

52. Cessation (*bhaṇga*) [or fear (*bhaya*)?] also exists.[141]

53. Ordinary meaning (*saṃvṛtyartha*) does not exist.[142]

54. Only minds (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) are both the cause of maturation (*vipakahetu*) and the fruit of maturation (*vipākaphala*).[143]

55. The matter (*rūpa*) of the person who is endowed with the Path (*maggasamaṇgī*) is the Path (*magga*).[144]

Right speech (*sammāvāca*), right action (*sammākammanta*), right livelihood (*sammājīva*) are substance and yet make up part of the Path.

56. There is development of the Path (*maggabhāvanā)* in the person who is endowed with the five consciousnesses (*pañcaviññaṇasamaṇgī*).[145]

The Buddha said: "Having seen (*disvā*) form (*rūpa*) by means of the eye (*cakkhu*), not having seized its attributes (*nimittaggāhī*) or its sub-attributes (*anubyañjanaggāhī*)… having heard (*sutvā)* sound (*sadda*) by means of the ear (*sota*)… having smelled (*ghayitvā)* odor (*gandha*) be means of the nose (*ghāna*)… having tasted (*sāyitvā*) flavor (*rasa*) by means of the tongue (*jivhā*)… having felt (*phusitvā)* touch (*phoṭṭhabba*) by means of the body (*kāya*)…" Consequently, the person who cultivates the Path is endowed with the five sense consciousnesses.

57. He who is provided with the Path (*maggasamaṇgī*) is endowed (*samannāgata*) with two virtues (*sīla*).[146]

"The person (*nara*) who is firmly established (*patiṭṭhāya*) in virtue is wise (*sapañña*)", it is said. Since the virtuous man (*sīlavā*) endowed with worldly (*lokiya*) virtue cultivates (*bhāveti*) the supramundane Path (*lokuttaramagga*), he is then endowed with two virtues, the first, the older (*purima*), being mundane, the other, produced at the moment of the Path (*maggakkhaṇa*) being supramundane (*lokuttara*).

58. Virtue (*sīla*) is not mental (*acetasika*).[147]

When one has produced (*uppajjitvā)* the virtues, since there is that which is called (*nāma*) accumulation of virtues (*sīlopacaya*) caused by the resolve of the one who is precisely called virtuous (*sīlavā),* virtue is not mental.

59. Virtue (*sīla*) does not come consecutive to the mind (*cittānuparivattī*).[148]

---

[141] Vinītadeva, thesis 17. - The meaning is enigmatic.
[142] Vinitadeva, thesis 24. - The meaning is enigmatic.
[143] *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 96a. – Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 271 and 287. No argument is known for this thesis the meaning of which is quite clear.
[144] *Kathāvatthu*, X, 1.
[145] Ibid., X, 2.
[146] Ibid., X, 6
[147] Ibid., X, 6. – See T.S. 1548, p. 574c-575a: the five virtues are material (*rūpa*).
[148] Ibid., X, 7. – See T.S. 1548, p. 575a.

This thesis is like the preceding one and its proof is the same.

60. The virtue (*sīla*) caused by resolve (*samādānahetuka*) increases (*vaḍḍhati*).[149]

The Buddha said: "Those who plant parks *(ārāmaropa*), who plant groves (*vanaropa*) [for the abode of monks], who practice the virtues (*sīlampanna*), those people are destined to go to Heaven (*saggagāmi*)." Consequently, merit (*puñña*) always (*sadā)* increases (*pavaḍḍhati*). <70>

61. Information (*viññatti*) is virtue (*sīla*).[150]

Information by means of the body (*kāyaviññati*) is physical action (*kāyakamma*) and information by means of speech (*vacīviññati*) is vocal action. Now virtue is physical action and vocal action. Therefore information by the body and information by speech are virtue. Also, one cannot truly say (*na hevaṃ vattabbe*) that information is immoral (*dussīlya*).

62. Non-information (*aviiññatti*) is immoral (*dussīlya*).[151]

Non-information is action known only by the agent. Crime (*pāpakamma*) had been *(āsi*) decided upon (*samḍinna*) and this decision was known only by the agent, therefore non-information is immoral. Non-information is fully provided with its factors (*aṇgapāripūri*) in the case of murder (*pāṇātipāda*) and the other wrong-doings. Being the nature *(āṇatti*) of committing them, it is the accumulation of demerit (*apuññupaccaya*) dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*), for it is part of both the aggregate of form (*rūpakkhandha*) and the realm and element of mental phenomena (*dhammāyatana, dhammadhātu*).

63. The latent tendencies (*anusaya*) are indeterminate (*abyākata*), uncaused (*ahetuka*) and dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*).[152]

The worldly person (*puthujjana*) must be said (*vattabba*) to lack the tendencies (*sānusaya*) when his mind (*citta*) remains (*vattamāna*) good (*kusala*) or indeterminate (*abyākata*). But it cannot be truly said (*na hevaṃ vattabbe*) that good and bad (*kusalākusala*) things (*dhamma*) come *(āgacchanti*) into conflict (*sammukhībhāva*) for him. Therefore the tendencies are indeterminate. Similarly, since it cannot be said that they are caused (*sahetuka*) by one cause (*hetu*), the tendencies are uncaused. Finally, since it cannot be said that they are associated (*sampayutta*) with the mind (*citta*), the tendencies are dissociated from the mind.

64. Ignorance (*aññana*) having been dispelled (*vigata*) and the mind (*citta*) remaining (*vattamāna*) dissociated from knowledge (*ñāṇavippayutta*), such a state cannot be called (*na vattabba*) the knower (*ñaṇī*).[153]

---

[149] Ibid., X, 8.
[150] Ibid., X, 9.
[151] Ibid., X, 10. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 2021, IV, p. 13 sq. T.S. 1548, p. 526e, 535c and 532a.
[152] Ibid., XI, 1. See above thesis 46.
[153] Ibid., XI, 2.

When ignorance is dispelled by knowledge of the Path (*maggañaṇa*) and the the mind remains dissociated from knowledge due to (*vasena*) the visual and the other sense consciousnesses (*cakkhuviññanādi*), since the mind of the Path (*maggacitta*) is not functioning (*nappavattati*), this mind state cannot be called the knower.

65. The person endowed (*samannāgata*) with supernatural pawer (*iddhibala*) is able to last (*tiṭṭheyya*) for a cosmic eon (*kappa*).[154]

The Buddha said: "The person who has cultivated (*bhāvita*), repeated (*bahulīkata*), rendered habitual (*yānīkata*), made fundamental (*vatthukata*), practiced (*anuṭṭhita*), familiarized (*paricita*), properly undertaken (*susamāraddha*), and the four bases of supernatural power (*iddhipāda*) will be able, if he so desires *(ākaṇkhamāna*), to last for a cosmic eon or the rest of a cosmic eon (*kappāvasesa*)." Therefore, he who is endowed with supernatural power is able to last for a cosmic eon.

66. Discipline (*saṃvara*) and non-discipline (*asaṃvara*) of the senses are actions (*kamma*).[155] <71>

The Buddha said: "Having seen (*disvā)* form (*rūpa*) with the eye (*cakkhus*), having heard (*sutvā)* with the ear (*sota*)… having cognized a mental phenomenon (*dhamma*) with the mind (*mano*), having grasped its attributes (*nimittaggāhī*)… not having grasped its attributes…" in order to define non-discipline and discipline. Therefore discipline and non-discipline are actions.

67. All (*sabba*) actions (*kamma*) are endowed with maturation (*savipāka*).[156]

The Buddha said: "As long as I have not experienced (*appaṭisaṃviditvā)* accomplished (*kata*), accumulated (*upacita*) and intentional (*sañtanika*) actions (*kamma*), I do not speak (*nāhaṃ vadāmi*) of their cessation (*byantībhāva*), but I say that visible (*diṭṭha*) things (*dhamma*) here below are present (*upapajja*) or future (*apara*) in mode (*pariyaya*)."

68. Sound (*sadda*) is maturation (*vipāka*).[157]

The Buddha said: "From the accomplishment (*katatta*), accumulation (*upacitatta*), amassing (*ussannatta*), development (*vipulatta*) of action (*kamma*), there comes a celestial sound (*brahmasvara*) like the voice of the cuckoo (*karavikabhāṇi*)." Consequently, sound is retribution.

69. The six sensory realms (*saḷāyatana*) are maturation (*vipāka*).[158]

Since the six sensory realms are produced (*uppanna*) as a result of accomplishment (*katatta*) of action (*kamma*), they are maturation.

---

[154] Ibid., XI, 5.
[155] Ibid., XII, 1.
[156] Ibid., XII, 2.
[157] Ibid., XII, 3. T.S. 1548 p. 540 ab, 531 c. See thesis 22 of the Vātsīputrīyas.
[158] Ibid., XII, 4.

70. The root of evil (*akusalamūla*) and the root of good (*kusulamūla*) arrange themselves (*paṭisandahanti*) mutually.[159]

One turns away (*virajjati*) from the object (*vatthu*) to which one is attached (*ajjati*) and one becomes attached to the object from which one turns away. Since one becomes attached to and turns away from the same object (*ekavatthusmiññeva*), the roots of good and of evil adjust themselves mutually (*aññamaññaṃ).*

71. Causality (*paccayatā)* is determinate (*vavatthitā*).[160]

For example, the thing that is causal condition (*hetupaccaya*) is not object condition *(ārammaṇapaccaya*) or immediately preceding condition (*anantarapaccaya*) or equal and immediate antecedent condition (*samanantarapaccaya*). Therefore a thing can be a condition in only one fashion, and causality is determined.

72. The psychological formations (*saṇkhāra*) are conditioned by unknowing (*avijjāpaccaya*), but it cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that unknowing (*avijja*) is conditioned by the formations (*saṇkhārapaccaya*).[161]

In other words, the causal relations are not reciprocal. No reasons for this thesis are mentioned by Buddhaghosa.

73. The old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*) of supramundane (l*okuttara*) things (*dhamma*) are supramundane.[162]

Since the old age and death of supramundane things are not mundane (*lokiya*), they are supramundane.

74. One person (*para*) controls (*niggaṇhāti*) another person's (*para*) mind (*citta*).[163]

If those who hve acquired increased power (*balappatta*) and mastery (*vasībhūta*) <72> in the world (*loka*) are unable (*na sakkuṇeyyuṃ)* to control another's mind, what then would be their increased power and their mastery? It is really by means of this increased power and this mastery that they control another's mind.

75. There is some (*kiñci*) bond (*saññojana*) that the person who has attained sainthood (*arahattappatti*) has not abandoned (*appahāya*).[164]

Since the Arhant does not cognize (*na jānāti*) the entire (*sabba*) objective domain of the Buddha (*buddhavisaya*), he cannot have abandoned (*appahīna*) unknowing (*avijjā)* and doubt (*vicikicchā).*

76. The five consciousnesses (*viññaṇa*) are endowed with thought (*sābhoga*).[165]

---

[159] Ibid., XIV, 1.
[160] Ibid., XV, 1.
[161] Ibid., XV, 2.
[162] Ibid., XV, 6.
[163] Ibid., XVI, 1.
[164] Ibid., XXI, 3.
[165] Ibid., X, 4.

In a Sutta, the Buddha said: "Having seen (*disvā)* form (*rūpa*) with the eye (*cakkhu*)… having touched (*phusitvā)* tangibles (*phoṭṭhabba*) wih the body (*kāya*), having grasped its attributes (*nimittaggahī*), not having grasped its attributes…" Consequently, the five sense consciousnesses are endowed with thought.

77. The supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) are included (*paryāpanna*) in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) and in the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*).[166]

Indeed, if on a level (*bhūmi*) there are relative knowledges (*saṃvṛtijñana*) bordering on perfect understanding (*abhisamaya*) [of the Truths], then on this bhūmi there are the supreme mundane dharmas.

78. There is a root consciousness (*mūlavijñana*) which serves as support *(āśraya*) for the visual consciousness (*cakṣurvijñana*) and the other sense consciousnesses like the root of the tree is the principle of the leaves, etc….[167]

The sense consciousnesses are unable to have the quality of root. The root consciousness, of which the *Agamas* of the Mahāsāṇghikas speak in an "esoteric" way, prefigures the storehouse-consciousness *(ālayavijñana*) of the Mahāyāna.

79. The actively functioning consciousnesses (*pravṛttivijñana*) can be simultaneous (*sahabhū*). The notion of perfuming (*vāsanā*) having been rejected, the functioning consciousnesses are not perfumable and do not carry the seeds (*bīja*).[168]

80. Faith (*śraddhā)* has adaptation (*anukūlatā)* as nature. Thus it will be of three kinds, good (*kuśala*), bad (*akuśala*) or indeterminate (*avyākṛta*) according to the kind of object to which one adapts oneself; it will be conviction (*adhimokṣa*) or inclination (*chanda*). If it is the adaptation of adhesion, it is conviction; if it is the adaption of indulgence, it is inclination. Outside of conviction and inclination, there is no adaptation.[169]

81. Heedfulness (*apramāda*) is the guardian *(ārakṣa*) of the mind (*citta*) that shelters it from defiled (*sāṃkleśika*) dharmas.[170]

According to Vasumitra, the four sects, the Mahāsāṇgjika, Lokottaravādin, Ekavyāvahārika and Gokulika, were in disagreement on some questions. Undoubtedly he means that at least one of these sects upheld the following theses:

(1) There are as many different clear understandings (*abhisamya*) as the noble Truths *(āryasatya*) have different aspects *(ākāra*).[171] <73>

---

[166] *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 14a. T. S. 1546, p. 9 (does not mention *rūpadhātu*).
[167] L.V.P.: *Siddhi*, p. 178-179.
[168] Ibid., p. 184 n. 2 and 186.
[169] Ibid., p. 322. But this seems to contradict thesis 38 above, because if faith is solely supramundane, it is solely good. Besides, the attribution of this thesis to the Mahāsāṇghikas is doubtful.
[170] L.V.P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 157.
[171] Vasumitra, thesis 1 of the second series. This is the opposite of thesis 23 above.

(2) There are a few dharmas that are made by themselves (*svayaṃkṛta*), a few dharmas that are made by others (*parakṛta*), a few dharmas that are made in both ways (*ubhayakṛta*), a few dharmas that arise as a result of conditions (*pratītyajāta*).[172]

(3) Two minds (*citta*) are produced together at the same moment.[173] The original schools held that the consciousnesses each arise separately. The secondary schools claim that two minds are produced at the same time because the objects (*viṣaya*) of the faculties (*indriya*) are produced together by the power (*bala*) of mental action (*mansikāra*).[174]

(4) The Path (*mārga*) and the afflictions (*kleśa*) appear together.[175]

The original schools asserted that, although the tendencies (*anuṣaya*) are able to exist separately, when the Path is produced, it cannot be said that it appears at the same time as the tendencies. The new schools say that, since the tendencies always exist, when the path is produced, it appears at the same time as them. As the *kleṣas* appear at the same time as the Path, they are now called *anuṣayas*.[176]

(5) Action (*karman*) and its maturation (*vipaka*) develop at the same time.[177]

Since the past (*atīta*) does not exist as a substance and since action and its fruit (*phala*) are produced at different times, as long as action is not exhausted it exists in a perpetual present (*pratyutpanna*) and, since its maturation is likewise present, the fruit exists at the same time as the action. The action that has borne fruit is exhausted, it no longer exists, it has entered into the past and necessarily it no longer exists at the same time.[178] This solution to the fruition of action is very close to that held by the Kāśyapīyas.

(6) The seeds (*bīja*) themselves are the sprouts (*aṇkura*).[179]

Form (*rūpa*) lasts for a long time [and is not destroyed each moment]. Since it has birth (*utpāda*) and cessation (*nirodha*), the substance (*dravya*) of the seeds is transformed into sprouts and no longer exists. As soon as the seeds have ceased to exist, the sprouts are produced.[180] This evolutionary thesis responds to the momentarism frequent in the doctrines of other sects.

---

[172] Vasumitra, thesis 2 of the second series. The commentary by K'ouei-ki. II, p. 49b, is reduced to a single line which does not clarify this text.
[173] Vasumitra, thesis 3 of the second series. – Vinītadeva, thesis 27. – *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545 p. 47b. – *Kathāvatthu*, V, 9, thesis of the Andhakas. See above, thesis 27.
[174] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 1b.
[175] Vasumitra, thesis 4 of the second series. – Vinītadeva, thesis 28.
[176] K'ouei-ki, III, 1b.
[177] Vasumitra, thesis 5 of the second series. –Vinītadeva, thesis 29. – *Kathāvatthu*, XV, 11, thesis of the Andhakas and the Sammatīyas.
[178] K'ouei-ki, III, 2a.
[179] Vasumitra, thesis 6 of the second series. –Vinītadeva, thesis 30: the seeds and the sprouts are produced at the same time.
[180] K'ouei-ki, III, 2ab.

(7) The great elements (*mahābhuta*) of the material (*rūpa*) faculties (*indriya*) develop (*pariṇamanti*). The mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) do not develop.[181]

Material (*rūpin*) dharmas last for a long time. Thus, because it has origination (*utpada*) and cessation (*kṣaya*), the substance (*dravya*) of milk (*kṣīra*) is changed into curdled milk (*dadhi*). The mind and mental events, having instantaneous (*kṣaṇika*) production and cessation, are not transformed from an earlier state to a later state [because their existence is too brief]. These sects maintain therefore that, since the sense faculties consist of <74> lumps of flesh (*maṃsapeśī*),[182] the great elements of which they are composed are transformed, whereas the mind and mental events are not transformed.[183]

(8) The mind (*citta*) penetrates the entire body (*kāya*) and, according to the object (*viṣaya*) and the support *(āśraya*), it is able to contract or expand.[184]

The subtle (*sūkṣma*) mental consciousness (*manovijñana*) [i.e., the mind] resides in the entire body which constitutes its support. If one hits one's hand and pricks one's foot, one can perceive simultaneously and feel both blows. This is why we know that the subtle mental consciousness resides everywhere in the body. Since not even a single moment (*ekakṣana*) elapses between the two feelings that would allow one to state that they were successive [and not simultaneous], we therefore know with certainty that the subtle mind resides everywhere in the body.[185] There is not first a combination of the support *(āśraya*) [i.e., the sense organ] and its object *(ālambana*) and then another combination in which the corresponding consciousness (*vijñana*) is added in addition to the two preceding ones conforming [with the modalities] of this organ (*indriya*) and this object. If one relies on a major organ and in addition one objectifies a large object (*viṣaya*) [such as a big mountain, the sound of thinder], the mind comes into conformity (*anurūpa*) with this organ and this objective domain and thus is said to be unwound, i.e., opened out. If, on the other hand, one relies on a minor organ and a small object [such as the tip of a hair or the buzzing of a mosquito], the mind conforms to this organ and this object and is thus said to be curled up, i.e., contracted.[186] <75>

[181] Vasumitra, thesis 7.
[182] See above, thesis 26.
[183] K'ouei-ki, III, 2b.
[184] Vasumitra, thesis 8. – Vinītadeva, thesis 31.
[185] K'ouei-ki, III, 3a.
[186] Ibid., III, p. 3b-4a.

CHAPTER II

The Lokottaravādins

According to the sources of the north-west *(Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*) and Vasumitra, the Lokottaravādin sect arose following the first internal schism of the Mahāsāṇghikas in the course of the 2nd century E.N., undoubtedly towards the end, at the same time as that of the Gokulikas and the Ekavyāvahārikas. Commenting on Vasumitra, Paramārtha states that this schism was caused by debates on the authenticity of the *Mahāyānasūtras*.[187]

Furthermore, the lists from the North-west are the only ones to distinguish the Lokottaravādins from the Ekavyāvārikas. The Theravādins and the Sammatīyas knew only the Ekavyāvahārikas and the Gokulikas. Vinītadeva and the authors inspired by him (*Varṣāgrapṛcchā*), on the other hand, were familiar only with the Lokottaravādins. As for the list of the Mahāsāṇghikas cited by Bhavya, it cites only the Mahāsāṇghikas and the Gokulikas.

Vasumitra does not distinguish the theses of the Mahāsāṇghikas from those of the Ekavyāvahārikas, the Lokottaravādins and the Gokulikas. The Sammatīyas of Bhavya attribute the theses which Vasumitra attributed jointly to the four sects to the Ekavyāvahārikas alone and do not give those of the Gokulikas. Vinītadeva attributes these same theses to the Lokottaravādins, ignoring the other two secondary sects. Tāranātha says that the Lokottaravādins and the Gokulikas formed only one school and that the word Ekavyāvahārika designated the Mahāsāṇghikas.[188]

Actually, it does seem likely that the Lokottaravādins are identical with the Ekavyāvahārikas who kept the name of Mahāsāṇghika after the schism which separated them from the Gokulikas. At least, the Lokottaravādins seem to have been the main school of the Ekavyāvahārikas.

Hiuan-tsang alone gives us information about their residence. He encountered several thousands of them living in about ten monasteries at Bāmiyān.[189] It seems as though the giant Buddhist statues at this famous site should be attributed to the Lokottaravādins.

According to Tāranātha, the Lokottaravādins still existed at the time of the seven Pāla kings (9th to 10th centuries C.E),[190] which seems confirmed by the fact that Vinītadeva also cites them. But then they must

---

Chapter II
[187] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 21 and 43.
[188] Schiefner: *Taranātha*, p. 273.
[189] Watters: *Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, p. 116-120.
[190] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 274.

have been residing only in Magadha and Bengal,[191] for the Moslem invasion reached Afghanistan at the end of the 8th century.

The first part of their *Vinyapiṭaka*, the *Mahāvastu*, has been preserved for us <76> in its original form. It is a voluminous collection of *Jātakas* written in a very altered Sanskrit or semi-Sanskrit. Clearly Lokottaravādin theses are found in it.[192]

According to Paramārtha, the Lokottaravādins maintained that the *laukikadharmas* have no reality, for they are the fuit of actions (*karman*) which themselves are the product of error (*viparyaya*). On the other hand, the *lokottaradharmas* exist, for they are not the products of error. "It is in them that the Path and the fruit of the Path exist. The fruit of the Path is the two *śūnyatās* [*pudgalaśūnyatā* and *dharmaśūnyatā;* the latter belongs to the Greater Vehicle]; the Path is the knowledge that allows the understnading of the two emptinesses.

The principle of the two emptinesses is real, and the knowledge of the two emptinesses is likewise real (true): a real object (*viṣaya*) is able to produce a real knowledge and by means of a real (true) knowledge, one can understand a real object; this is why the Path also (like its fruit) has a real existence."[193]

Among the theses attributed generally to the Mahāsāṇghikas, Ekavyāvahārikas, Lokottaravādins[194] and even the Gokulikas and Andhakas are some that seem more precisely Lokottaravādin, in the sense that they present the Buddhas and, to some extent, the Bodhisattvas, as being supramundane (*lokottara*).

1. The Buddhas are supramundane (*lokottara*).[195]
2. They lack impurities or mundane *(laukika)* dharmas.[196]
3. By means of each of their words (*vāca*), the Buddhas turn the wheel of the Dharma (*dharmacakraṃ pravartayanti*).[197]
4. By means of a single sound *(śabda*), the Buddhas pronounce all the elements of the Dharma (*dharmadhātu*).[198]
5. There is nothing that does not have meaning in what the Buddhas say.[199]
6. The words of the Buddhas manifest their essence (*garbha*).[200]
7. The material body (*rupakāya*) of the Buddhas is limitless (*ananta*).[201]
8. The longevity of the Buddhas is infinite (*ananta*).[202]

---

[191] Ibid., p. 236 mentions the presence of the Mahāsāṇghikas at Vikramaśilā under the Senas (12th century).
[192] *Mahāvastu*, ed. Senart, I, p.48, 159, 167, 170, 193, etc.
[193] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 21, 42 and 45. – K'ouei-ki: *Commentary on Vasumitra*, p. 40ab.
[194] For the collection of the common theses, see above, 1st chapter.
[195] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 1; Vinītadeva, thesis 1. Kathāvatthu, II, 8, thesis of the Andhakas.
[196] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Bhavya, theses 2 and 5.
[197] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Vinītadeva, thesis 7; Bhavya, thesis 3, says the opposite.
[198] Vasumitra, thesis 4.
[199] Vasumitra, thesis 5.
[200] Bhavya, thesis 4.
[201] Vasumitra, thesis 6; Vinītadeva, thesis 3.

9. The power (*prabhāva*) of the Buddhas is infinite (*ananta*).[203]
10. The Buddhas exist as substance (*dravya*).[204]
11. The Buddhas are in perpetual meditation (*samādhi*).[205]
12. The Buddhas never pronounce even a single word but, believing that they speak, beings leap for joy.[206]
13. The Buddhas neither sleep nor dream.[207]
14. So as to convert beings, the Buddhas make a pure (*śuddha*) faith (*śraddhā)* arise in them without them having any satiation of mind.[208]<77>
15. The Buddhas answer people's questions without needing to think about them.[209]
16. The Buddhas understand everything by a single moment of mind (*ekakṣaṇikacitta*).[210]
17. The Buddhas know everything by a wisdom (*prajñā)* associated (*saṃprayukta*) with a single instant of mind (*ekakṣaṇikacitta*).[211]
18. In the Buddhas, the knowledge of exhaustion (*kṣayajñana*) and the knowledge of non-production (*anutpādajñana*) continue without stopping until they enter into parinirvāṇa.[212]
19. The Bodhisattvas do not take on the *kalala, arbuda peśī* and *ghana* forms as their own substance when they enter into a womb.[213]
20. The Bodhisattvas do not produce the mind of desire (*kāma*), malice (*vyāpāda*) or harmfulness (*vihiṃsā*).[214]
21. The Bodhisattvas enter into the womb by way of the mother's side in the form of a white elephant.[215]
23. The Bodhisattvas, by their own will, are born in the bad destinies (*durgati*) in order to perfect beings (*sattva*).[216]

The major features of the Lokottaravādion doctrine, insofar as the latter concerns the ontology of the conceptions of the Buddha and the Bodhisattva, are very close to the basic elements of the Mahāyāna doctrine. It seems that it is particularly to the Lokottaravādins that we owe the concept of the transcendant Buddha, doceticism and the emphasis on the career of the Bodhisattvas which characterize the Mahayāna,

---

[202] Vasumitra, thesis 8; Vinītadeva, thesis 3.
[203] Vasumitra, thesis 7.
[204] Vinītadeva, thesis 2.
[205] Vasumitra, thesis 12; Vinītadeva, thesis 4.
[206] Vasumitra, thesis 12.
[207] Vasumitra, thesis 10.
[208] Vasumitra, thesis 9.
[209] Vasumitra, thesis 11.
[210] Vasumitra, thesis 13.
[211] Vasumitra, thesis 14; Vinītadeva, thesis 5.
[212] Vasumitra, thesis 15; Vinītadeva, thesis 6.
[213] Vasumitra, thesis 16, Bhavya, thesis 6, Vinītadeva, thesis 9.
[214] Vasumitra, thesis 19; Bhavya, thesis 8, Vinītadeva, thesis 8.
[215] Vasumitra, thesis 17; Bhavya, thesis 7.
[216] Vasumitra, thesis 20; Bhavya, thesis 9; *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 3, thesis of the Andhakas.

the Greater Vehicle being, by definition, the Bodhisattva Vehicle. The doctrine of the transcendance of the Buddha is clearly the seed of the doctrine, so dear to the heart of the Mahāyāna, of the three bodies (*trikāya*) of the Buddha. <78>

CHAPTER III

The Ekavyāvahārikas

This is one of the two or three sects that arose in the first internal schism of the Mahāsāṇghika, in the course of the 2nd century C.E., undoubtedly towards the end, according to the traditions of the north-west. According to Paramārtha, the schism resulted from the debates on the authentitcity of the Mahāyanasūtras.[217]

We have seen that the Ekavyāvahārikas seem to be confused with the Lokottaravādins and the orthodox Mahāsāṇghikas.[218]

We have no information regarding their peaticular residence, no doubt because they were better known by the name of Mahāsāṇghika.

According to Paramārtha, they maintained that everything is fictive, the absolute as dependent, which, it seems, was the doctrine of the mother Mahāsāṇghika school prior to the schism. For them, saṃsāra and nirvāna, the *laukika* dharmas and the *lokottara* dharmas, were purely provisional (*prajñapti*), names only, and lacking in real substance. "Therefore to all dharmas one and the same name is applied, in other words, a 'single utterance'; hence the name of this school."[219]

This fundamental non-realism, which identifies the most differing entities by being based on their non-substantiality, is very close to the doctrine of *śunyatā* which characterizes the Mahāyāna and which is described especially in the *Prajñapāramitāsūtra*.[220]

If they were distinct from the Lokottaravādins, the Ekavyāvahārikas disappeared between the 4th and the 9th centuries C.E. according to some information given by Tāranātha.[221] It is possible that they were absorbed by the Lokottaravādins or that they passed into the Mahāyāna.

The tradition called Sthavira cited by Bhavya at the beginning of his treatise explains their name as follows: "Some say: 'Completely knowing (*vijñamāna*) by one single mind (*ekacittena*) all the Dharmas *(sarvadharma*) of the Buddha Bhagavants, in one single moment (*ekakṣaṇe*) one knows everything

---

Chapter III
[217] Demiéville: *Origines des sectes bouddhiques*, p 21 and 43.
[218] Cf. above, chap. II.
[219] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 21, 42 and 45; K'ouei-ki: *Commentary on Vasumitra*, p. 39b-41a.
[220] For the rest of their doctrine, see above, chap. I, the theses shared by the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[221] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 175 and 274.

(*sarvadharma*) completely by means of the wisdom (*prajnā)* with which one is endowed."[222] Because they are linked to such a practice (*vyavahāra*), they are called Ekavyavahārikas." <79>

[222] See Vasumitra, theses 13 aned 14; Vinitadeva, thesis 5.

CHAPTER IV

The Gokulikas or Kukkutikas

This is one of the two or three sects that arose from the first schism of the Mahāsāṇgikas towards the end of the 2nd century C.E., if one is referring to the traditions of the north-west. According to Paramārtha, the schism was due to discussions related to the authenticity of the *Mahāyānasūtras*.

The various traditions disagree on their real name and its meaning. The Ceylonese Chronicles and Buddhaghosa have Gokulika, which can be interprested as 'being part of the ox (*go*) family (*kula*)', or, 'with shifty eyes'.[223] But thesis II, 6, of the *Kathāvatthu*, attributed by Buddhaghosa to the Gokulikas, is entitled *kukkuḷakathā,* 'discussion on the hot ashes', which seems to point to the presence of the form *kukkuḷaka* and its interpretation at an early date in Ceylon. The Tibetans have *ba-laṇ gnas-pa*, 'the place of the bullock' which would give Gokulika; and *bya-gag-ris*, 'the area of the poultry', which would give Kukkuṭika. The Chinese have *ki-in*, 'of the family of the Galliformes', which would give Kukkuṭika or Kaukkuṭika; *houei-chan*, 'mountain of ashes' which is related to the Pāli Kukkuḷaka, and various transcriptions of Kaukkuṭika or Kukkuṭika. Thus we are faced with three basic forms: Gokulika 'of the ox family'; Kaukkuṭika, 'related to the cockerel'; Kukkuḷaka, 'related to ashes'. It is not possible for us to determine the original form of this name.

K'ouei-ki says that it is the patronymic name of a brāhmana. A long time ago, a sage *(ṛṣi*) fell in love with a hen (*kukkuṭā)* and with her had descendants who took the name of Kukkuṭika amongst the Brāhmanic clans. The *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra* says that their name is derived from that of a Vinaya master. Paramārtha interprets the name as meaning 'those who live on the mountain of ashes', Kukkuḷagiriya (?), but K'ouei-ki questions that the original form of the name and the meaning are in accord with this explanation.

According to Paramārtha and K'ouei-ki, the Kukkuṭikas maintained that, of the three *Piṭakas*, only the *Abhidharma* is important and not the *Sūtra* and the *Vinaya* because the Abhidharma represents the real teaching of the Buddha whereas the Sūtras and the Vinaya represent only the preparatory teaching (*upāya*). Thus they were freed from any disciplinary duties, interpreting the Vinaya rules according to their own particular convenience, claiming that the Buddha had allowed them to be transgressed. They cultivated only logic, claiming that an excessively profound study of the *Sutras* necessarily made pride arise and thus prevented the attainment of liberation (*vimukti*). They also cultivated right exertion (*samyagvīrya*) <80> necessary for the practice of logic. Likewise they refused to preach so as to be able to dedicate themselves to meditation.[224]

[223] Monier-Williams: *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 364a.

Buddhaghosa attributes to them the thesis of the *Kathāvatthu* according to which all the formations (*saṇkhāra*) without distinction (*anodhiṃ katvā)* are merely ashes (*kukkuḷa*).[225] In this they referred to the Sutta in which the Buddha said that all the formations are burned *(āditta*) by the fire of passion (*rāga*), aggression (*dosa*) and delusion (*moha*).

Nothing is known of their particular residence or their literature. Vasumitra attributes to them the same theses as the other Mahāsāṃghikas. Bhavya distinguishes them from the latter but does not mention their doctrine, limiting himself to citing those of the two sects derived from the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Bahuśrutiya and the Prajñaptivādin.

From information given by Tāranātha, it may be deduced that the Gokulikas or Kukkuṭikas disappeared between the 4th and the 9th centuries C.E.[226] It is possible that they became completely assimilated into the Mahāyāna. <81>

Chapter IV
[224] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 21-22 and 42-43.
[225] Kathāvatthu, II, 6.
[226] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 175 and 274.

CHAPTER V

The Bahuśrutīyas

They arose from a schism that occurred at the end of the 2nd century E.N., according to the traditions of the north-west, directly from the womb of the Mahāsāṇghikas, or among the Gokulikas according to the Theravādin and Sammatīya traditions.

Their name means 'those who have heard much', thus the scholars, the learned ones.

According to Paramārtha and K'ouei-ki, their sect was founded by the Arhant or Asaikṣa Yājñavalkya who, having withdrawn into the Himālaya during the lifetime of the Buddha, remained in samādhi for almost 200 years. Having awoken at the end of this time and leaving the mountains, he noticed that the Mahasanghikas developed only the superficial meaning of the *Tripiṭaka* and not the profound meaning. He then expounded the profound meaning along with the superficial meaning and created a new school bearing the name of Bahuśrutīya. According to Paramārtha, the profound meanong of the *Tripiṭaka* was the doctrine of the Mahāyāna, and the *Satyasiddhiśāstra* of Harivarman belonged to this sect.[227]

The *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, of which there is a Chinese translation by Kumārajīva (T.S. 1646), seems indeed to belong to this school.[228] Its author, Harivarman, was a native of central India and lived in the 3rd century C.E.

This work refers several times to an *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of six *pādas*, similar to that of the Sarvāstivādins,[229] and cites a Canon with six Baskets: *Sūtrapiṭaka, Vinayapiṭaka*, *Abhidharmapiṭaka, Saṃyuktapiṭaka* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*.[230] On the other hand, the doctrine that it describes is mid-way between that of the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna. In it, the main thesis attributed By Vasumitra to the Bahuśrutiyas on the supramundane teaching of the Buddha is more or less completely expressed.[231] As Vasumitra notes a doctrinal relationship between the Bahuśrutīyas and the Sarvāstivādins, it is not surprising that their first three canoncial Baskets and especially their *Abhidharmapiṭaka* should resemble one another. We may even wonder whether the Bahuśrutīyas did not borrow the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Sarvāstivādins, even if they did make it undergo some changes.

We know very little in regard to their residences, but even this little is very interesting. Inscriptions at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa mention their presence at that spot in the 3rd century C.E.[232] Another attests to their

---

Chapter V
[227] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 22 and 47; *K'ouei-ki*: I, p. 42ab.
[228] Lin Li Kouang: *Introduction*, p. 45 n. 5; Johnston: *Buddhacarita*. Introduction, p. xxxi-xxxv.
[229] T.S. 1646, p. 297c and 300b.
[230] Ibid., p. 352c.
[231] Ibid., p. 248c, 250 bc and *passim*.
[232] Sastri: *Ep. Ind*., vol. XX, 1929-1930, p. 24; Sastri: *Ep. Ind*., vol. XXI, 1931, p. 62-63.

existence at Pāḷātū <82> Ḍherī Jars, near Peshawar, in the 5th century C.E.[233] Therefore the Bahuśrutīyas must have resided both in the north-west around Peshawar and in the south-east around Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, i.e., in the two principal centers of the Mahāsāṇghika group outside of Magadha. Having appeared at the time of fhe second internal schism of the Mahāsāṇghikas, they seem to have been the link in time and space between the two Mahāsāṇghika groups, those of the north-west, Lokottaravādin and Ekavyāvahārika, and those of the south-east, Caityaka, Pūrvaśaila and Aparaśaila. The contact between these two groups and the establishment of a twofold stream of influence between the north-west and the south-east is due to them.

Finally, we may recall that Vasumitra, who places them among the sects derived from the Mahāsāṇghikas, notes their doctrinal relationship with the Sarvāstivādins, and that Vinītadeva makes them the fifth sect of the Sarvāstivādin group. Here are the theses attributed to them by Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva:

1. Five ponts of the Buddha's teaching are supramundane (*lokottara*): impermanence (*anityatā),* suffering (*duḥkha*), emptiness (*śūnyatā),* non-self (*anātmya*) and *nirvāṇa*, which are salutary (*niryānika*) and can lead to the Path of deliverance (*vimuktimārga*). The rest of the Buddha's teaching is mundane (*lauikika*).[234]

Acording to K'ouei-ki, it is the very sounds by means of which this five-fold teaching is expressed and which constitute the substance (*dravya*) of the latter that are supramundane. Thanks to them, one can transcend the world and attain deliverance. Since they allow the Path to be produced, they are called supramundane.

2. The five propositions of Mahādeva on the nature of the Arhant.[235]

3. On the salutary (*niryānika*) Path (*mārga*), there is no analysis (*vicāra*).[236]

No commentary on this thesis is given.

4. The Truth of suffering (*duḥkhasatya*), the relative Truth (*saṃvrtisatya*) and the noble Truth *(āryasatya*) are the Truths (*satya*).[237]

No commentary on this thesis is given.

5. One enters into absorption (*samāpatti*) by the seeing of the suffering of the formations (*saṃskāraduḥkhatā),* but not by the seeing of the suffering of suffering (*duḥkhaduḥkhatā)* or the suffering of change (*pariṇāmaduḥkhatā*).[238]

No commentary on this thesis is given.

6. The Community (*saṃgha*) is supramundane (*lokottara*).[239]

---

[233] Sten Konow: C. I. I., vol. II, part 1: *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, p. 120-122.
[234] Vasumitra, theses 1 and 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 1, replaces suffering by the Path (*marga*) which hardly changes the general meaning of the proposition.
[235] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Vinītadeva 2 (partial); Bhavya theses 5, 6 and 7 (partial). See thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[236] Bhavya, thesis 1.
[237] Bhavya, thesis 2. See T.S. 1647, p. 380a, thesis attributed to the Prajñaptivādins.
[238] Bhavya, thesis 3. See T.S. 1646, p. 282bc, 327 seq. And 334bc.
[239] Bhavya, thesis 4.

No commentary is given on this thesis.

Here are the main theses found in the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*:

1. There are two truths, one mundane (*laukika*) or relative (*saṃvṛti*) truth and one supreme or absolute (*paramārtha*) truth.[240]
2. Everything is but provisionally existent (*prajñapti*) and without real existence.[241]<83>
3. The person (*pudgala*) does not really exist as the Vatsīputrīyas assert.[242]
4. The Buddha is not included in the Saṃgha as the Mahīśāakas assert.[243]
5. It cannot be said that the past action whose maturation has not yet ripened exists and that the rest of the past does not exist as the Kāśyapīyas assert.[244]
6. It cannot be said either that everything exists, or that the past and the future exist, or that they do not exist.[245]
7. It cannot be said that the intermediary existence (*antarābhava*) exists or that it does not exist.[246]
8. It cannot be said that clear realization (*abhisamaya*) is progressive or not.[247]
9. It cannot be said that the Arhant can fall to a lower state or not.[248]
10. It cannot be said that the mind (*citta*) is pure (*prabhāsvara*) in nature or not. [249]
11. It cannot be said that the latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*) or dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[250]
12. He who gives a gift to the Buddha or the Saṃgha will receive a great fruit (*mahāphala*) for both are the most auspicious fields of meri (*puṇyakṣetra*).[251]
13. The fetters (*samyojana*) cannot be abandoned by the mundane Path (*laukikamārga*).[252]
14. There are ten emptinesses (*śūnyatā)* in the sense of non-self (*anātmya*).[253]
15. Impermance (*anītyatā),* suffering (*duḥkhatā),* non-self (*anātmya*) and especially emptiness (*śūnyatā)* play a great role and are often cited.[254]
16. Nirvāṇa is unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*).[255]

---

[240] T.S. 1646, p. 242b, 248a. 327a seq and *passim*. This is the central theme of the work and is frequently dealt with.
[241] Ibid., p. 327a-328c and *passim*.
[242] Ibid., p. 259a-260c.
[243] Ibid., p. 258c-259a.
[244] Ibid., p. 258c.
[245] Ibid., p. 255a-256b. This may be compared with the ontological theory of the Andhakas, *Kathāvatthu*, I, 10.
[246] Ibid., p. 256b-257a.
[247] Ibid., p. 257ab.
[248] Ibid., p. 257b-258a.
[249] Ibid., p. 258b.
[250] Ibid., p. 258bc.
[251] Ibid., p. 247ab.
[252] Ibid., p. 246.
[253] Ibid., p. 364c-365a. No details are given.
[254] Ibid., p. 248c, 150bc, 327ac, 322c and *passim*.
[255] Ibid., 252b nd 368c.

17. Space *(ākāśa*) is unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*).[256]

18. It cannot be said either that the unconditioned dharmas (*asaṃskṛta*) really exist for they are pure absences, or do they not exist.[257]<84>

[256] Ibid., p. 343bc.
[257] Ibid., p. 368c-369a, 343bc.

CHAPTER VI

The Prajñaptivādins

According to the traditions of the north-west, the Prajñaptivādins made up the sect that separated from the Mahāsāṃghikas immediately after the Bahuśrutīyas, at the end of thje 2nd century E.N. According to the Theravādins and the Sammatīyas, they broke away from the Gokulikas with the Bahuśrutīyas. We may wonder if they did not, along with the latter two sects, constitute the two parts of of the Gokulika sect after the schism that divided it.

Their name means 'the nominalists', those who hold the doctrine of designation (*prajñapti*).

Paramārtha, although commenting on Vasumitra who represents the tradition of the north-west, says that the Prajñaptivādins were a reformed school of the Bahuśritīyas and called themn Bahuśrutīya-Vibhajyavādins, 'those who make distinctions (*vibhajya*) [in the doctrine of the] Bahuśrutīyas'. They distinguish the imaginary from the real, the absolute truth (*parmārtha*) from the contingent truth (*saṃvṛti*). They had as their founder Mahākatyāyāna who had lived at lake Anavatapta in the Himālaya at the source of the Sutlej since the Nirvāṇa and who came out 200 years later in order to go to Magadha to carry out his reforms. The latter produced a new school.[258]

According to K'ouei-ki, they say that the *laukika* and *lokottara* dharmas are partially imaginary. But since, for them, the dharmas are not a designation of unequivocal nature, the Prajñaptivādins are not identical to the Ekavyāvahārikas and, since all the *lokottara* dharmas are not entirely real in their eyes, they are not confused with the Lokottaravādins. For them, the *laukika* and *lokottara* dharmas are partly imaginary and partly real.[259]

Saṇghabhadra attributes to them the thesis according to which present dharmas are purely imaginary, distinguishing them both from the Vibhajyavādins for whom only the present and past action that has not yet given its fruit exist, the Instantaneists, and the Nihilists, for whom all dharmas lack self nature (*svabhāva*) and are like sky-flowers (*khapuṣpa*).[260]

Vasuvarman also distinguished the Prajñaptivādins from the Vibhajyavādins whom Paramārtha and K'ouei-ki tend to confuse. According to him, the Prajñaptivādins say: "There are three kinds of truth (*satya*), namely, the category of suffering (*duḥkhavarga*), the conventional truth (*saṛtisatya*) and the noble truth *(āryasatya*). The category of suffering is the suffering of the five aggregates of grasping (*upādānaskandha*). Conventional truth is the suffering characterized by hatred and violence. The noble

---

Chapter VI
[258] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 22 and 49; K'ouei-ki, p. 42b-43a.
[259] K'ouei-ki, p. 42b
[260] K'ouiei-ki, p. 42b.

truth is the unique flavor (*ekarasa*) of suffering." For the Vibhajyavādins: "All composite formations (*saṃskṛta*) are totally suffering because they are impermanent <85> (*anitya*)".[261] The thesis attributed here to the Prajñaptivādins is attributed by Bhavya to the Bahuśrutīyas.[262] As to that attributed by Vasuvarman to the Vibhajyavādins, Vasumitra attributes it to the Prajñaptivādins.[263] We may wonder whether Vasuvarman was not mistaken. It is possible, but it also seems that the doctrinal differences between the Bahuśrutīyas and the Prajñaptivādins were not very great since the *Satyasaiddhiśāstra*, which belongs to the former, puts forth as its own the thesis according to which all dharmas are of purely nominal existence (*prajnapti*).[264]

Here are the theses attributed to them by Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva:

1. Suffering (*duḥkha*) is not an aggregate (*skandha*) nor does it exist outside of the aggregates.[265]

Suffering is that which oppresses, that which causes violence. But that is not the meaning of the word 'aggregate'. Consequently, the aggregates are not suffering.[266]

2. The twelve realms *(āyatana*) are not finished and completed realities.[267]

Being merely accumulations of elements, things are imaginary. Since their nature varies with time, they cannot be said to be finished realities.[268]

3. Conditioned phenomena (*saṃskṛta*), which form by interdependence, are suffering (*duhkha*) since they are simply denominations (*prajñapti*).[269]

The commentary by K'ouei-ki does not add anything of clear meaning to this proposition.

4. Suffering (*duḥkha*) is an absolute reality (*paramārtha*).[270]

There is no commentary on this thesis.

5. The person (*puruṣa*) is not the agent (*kārtṛ*).[271]

K'ouei-ki's commentary seems to be in error.

6. There is no premature death (*akālamaraṇa*); it is antecedent actions (*pūrvakarman*) which cause death.[272]

K'ouei-ki's commentary does not add anything of clear meaning to this proposition.

7. All sufferings (*duḥka*) come from actions (*karman*).[273]

There is no commentary on this thesis.

---

[261] T.S. 1647, p. 380a. See below thesis 3.
[262] Bhavya, thesis 2 of the Bahuśrutīyas.
[263] Vasumitra, thesis 3 of the Prajñaptivādins.
[264] T.S. 1646, p. 327abc and 328-334.
[265] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 1. Cf. *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 5.
[266] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 6a.
[267] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Bhavya, thesis 2. Cf. *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 5.
[268] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 7ab.
[269] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Bhavya, thesis 3 (partial).
[270] Bhavya, thesis 4. See *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 5.
[271] Vasumitra, thesis 3b; Bhavya, thesis 7; Vinītadeva, thesis 1a.
[272] Vasumitra, thesis 4; Bhavya, thesis 6; Vinītadeva, thesis 1b. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 218; III, p. 176. *Kathāvatthu*, XVII, 2.
[273] Bhavya, thesis 8.

8. The Path (*mārga*) is not a mental event (*caitta*).[274]

Lacking a commentary, it is not possible to understand the meaning of this proposition.

9. Due to the accumulation of actions (*karmanupacaya*), there is the development of the fruit of maturation (*vipākaphala*).[275]<86>

K'ouei-ki's commentary adds nothing to the meaning of this proposition.

10. The noble Path *(āryamārga*) is acquired through merit (*puṇya*).[276]

The pure (*anāsrava*) knowledges (*jñāna*) are acquired by means of moral practices *(śīla*) and the merit that they procure.

11. The Path (*mārga*) cannot be cultivated (*bhāvayitavya*).[277]

Accordiong to K'ouei-ki, this proposition is a corollary of the previous one.

12. The Path (*mārga*) cannot be destroyed (*bhaṇgya*).[278]

When one has acquired the noble Path, one remains there definitively.

Vasumitra notes that the other Prajñaptivādin theses were similar to those of the Mahāsāṇghikas. This is not surprising, seeing their origin, but in this way they differ from those of the Bahuśrutīyas which Vasumitra and Vinītadeva present as having undergone Sarvāstivādin influence. Perhaps the main difference between the two sects lay simply in that the one remained faithful to the Mahāsāṇghika tendencies whereas the other was to a certain degree attracted by the Sarvāstivādin doctrine.

We know nothing about either the residences of the Prajñaptivādins or their literature.

Tāranātha notes that the Prajñaptivādins still lived in Magadha under the Pāla dynasty (9th to 10th century).[279]<87>

[274] Bhavya, thesis 5. The contrary thesis in the Theravādins (*Vibhaṇga*, XI, 3), Sarvāstivādins (L.V.P., *Kośa*, II, p. 149-177) and in the *Śāriputrābhidharma* (T.S. 1648, p. 555c).
[275] Vasumitra, thesis 5.
[276] Vasumitra, thesis 6a; Vinītadeva, thesis 2.
[277] Vasumitra, thesis 6b; Vinītadeva, thesis 3 (E.P), but E.N. says the opposite, undoubtedly wrong.
[278] Vasumitra, thesis 7; Vinītadeva, thesis 4.
[279] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 274.

CHAPTER VII

The Caitīyas or Caitikas

According to the sources of the north-west, the Caitiyas appeared right at the start of the 3rd century E.N., following an internal schism of the Mahāsāṇghikas. According to the Sammatīyas, they were the outcome of a subsequent schism that occurred in the bosom of the Gokulika sect.

Vasumitra explains the arising of the Caitīyas is this way: "When the second century had past, there was a heretic who had gone forth from home (*pravrājaka*), who had abandoned falsehood (*mithyātva*) and had taken refuge in propriety (*samyaktva*) and whose name was Mahādeva. Having 'gone forth' in the Mahāsāṇghika sect, he received full ordination. Learned (*bahuśruta*), full of energy (*vīrya*), he lived at the Mountain of the Shrine (*caityaśīlā).* Along with the community (*saṇgha*) of this sect, he re-examined the five propositions [of the first Mahādeva],[280] bringing about debates and division into three sects: Caityaśaila, Aparaśaila and Uttaraśaila."[281]

According to Paramārtha, the debates had to do with ordination and virtue (*śīla*): "If the master violates the *śīla*, can the disciple attain it?" The result was a division of the community into five schools which quarreled, the discord being reinforced by the fact that heretics, having ordained themselves, were introduced into the Community. Rejected by all, excommunicated by the Mahāsāṇghikas, the new Mahādeva and his disciples finally withdrew into the mountains where they divided into two sects, Caityaśaila and Uttaraśaila.[282]

This story of a second Mahādeva provoking a new schism by debates on the five theses of the first Mahādeva, seems to be due merely to a confusion between the two schisms. Similarly, the information of Paramārtha according to which the debate was concerned with the precepts (*śīla*) seems to have been based on a bad pun <88> about *śīla* 'precepts' and *śilā* 'rock' to explain the names of the Pūrvaśailas and the Uttaraśailas.

Inscriptions mention the presence of the Caitīyas at Amarāvatī in the reign of Vāṣiṭhiputasāmi Siri Pulumāvi, i.e., in the first half of the 2nd century of our era.[283] The Caitīyas were thus one of the first schools of the Mahāsāṇghika group of the South. Although Buddhaghosa does not mention them among the Andhaka sects, there is no doubt that the Caitīyas were part of this group. Not only do the inscriptions prove it but also Vaumitra and the Mahāsāṇghikas of Bhavya attest to this fact. The Caitīyas are the oldest sect the presence of which in the land of Andhra is shown by inscriptions. We may wonder whether this is

---

Chapter VII
[280] See above, chap. I.
[281] The tradition of the Sammatīyas
[282] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 22, 51 and 52.
[283] *Archeological Survey of South India*, vol. I, p. 100 and 101. *Ep. Ind*., vol. X, 1912, nos. 1248 and 1263.

the sect that evangelized this country and founded in it the important Buddhist center the existence of which archeology and epigraphy have revealed to us. Likewise it seems that the other Andhaka sects, Aparaśaila, Pūrvaśaila or Uttaraśaila, Rājagirika and Siddhārthika, were only schools split off at various times from the Caitīya sect. We may also think of their probable relationship with the Bahuśrutīyas whose presence in this region is also attested by epigraphy and seek their origin among the latter, or at least among the Gokulikas as the Sammatīya tradition would have it.

We know nothing of their literature nor of the time at which they disappeared.

Vasumitra alone gives us some information on their doctrine which, besides, he does not distinguish from that of the Aparaśailas and the Uttaraśailas.

1. The Bodhisattvas do not avoid the bad destinies (*durgati*).[284] This is a thesis shared with the Mahāṇghikas of the South.[285]

2. The action of venerating (*pūjākāra*) a reliquary (*stūpa*) does not bring a great fruit (*mahāphala*).[286]

3. The five propositions of the first Mahādeva.[287]

This is not surprising in a sect coming from the Mahāsāṇghikas. Besides, Vasumitra states that the remainder of their doctrine was similar to that of the Mahāsāṇghikas.

If, as seems likely, the Caitīyas were the mother sect of the Andhaka schools, we can attribute also to them the greater part of the theses which Buddhaghosa attributes to the latter. <89>

[284] Vasumitra, thesis 1.
[285] Vasumitra, thesis 20 of the Mahṣāṇghika; Bhavya, thesis 9 of the Ekavyāvahārika; *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 3, thesis attributed to the Andhaka.
[286] Vasumitra, thesis 2.
[287] Vasumitra, thesis 3.

CHAPTER VIII

The Andhakas

Buddhaghosa designates the group of the Pubbaseliyas, Aparasaliyas, Rājagiriyas and Siddhatthikas by this name.[288] He attributes to them in general 72 theses of the *Kathāvatthu*, thus making them doctrinally the best-known group to the Ceylonese tradition. Inscriptions and information by Hiuan-tsang testify that at least the first two of these four sects lived in the delta of the Kistna around Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, i.e., in eastern Andhra, whence their name. Although the Ceylonese tradition, represented by the *Chronicles* and by Buddhaghosa's commentary, does not formally specify the relationships existing between the Andhakas and the classical sects, the other traditions and the group of opinions that Buddhaghosa attributes to them agree in making them a relatively late subgroup of the Mahāṣaṇghikas, more particularly allied to the Caitikas. The fact that the presence of the latter is vouched for by the Amarāvatī inscriptions of the 2nd century of our era, and that alone, shows that the four Andhaka sects most likely issued from the Caitikas of that region. Consequently, it is probable that most of the theses attributed to the Andhakas by Buddhaghosa also belong to the mother-sect of the Caitikas. A number of them besides were also held by the Mahāsāṇghikas of the North as we know from the non-Ceylonese sources.

Here are their theses:

1. All (*sabbe*) things (*dhamma*) are supports for mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*).[289]

Since mindfulness (*sati*) is established (*santiṭṭhati*) in that which is concerned with everything (*sabbe dhamme*), all things can be supports for mindfulness. Furthermore, it has been taught by the Buddha: "O monks, I am going to teach (*desissāmi*) you the origin (*samutthāna*) and the disappearance (*atthaṇgama*) of the four supports of mindfulness: as it has been said (*vuttanayena*), the body, etc., (*kāyādaya*) are associated with (*saṃyutta*) the supports of mindfulness and are objects *(ārammaṇadhamma*) of mindfulness."

2. The past (*atīta*), the future (*anāgata*), the present (*paccuppanna*), form (*rūpa*) and the other aggregates (*khanda*), everything truly (*heva*) exists (*atthi*) and does not truly exist (*natthi*).[290]

Thus, the past exists as past but does not exist as future or present, form exists as form but does not exist as feeling, perception, etc. <90>

3. A single (*eka*) mind (*citta*) lasts (*tiṭthati*) for a day (*divasa*) or longer.[291]

Chapter VIII
[288] Kathāvatthu, I, 9.
[289] Ibid., II, 9.
[290] Ibid., I, 10.
[291] Ibid., II, 7.

Having established (*disvā)* that the mind of absorption (*samāpatti*) or the element of existence (*bhavaṇga*) exists (*pavattamāna*) uninterruptedly (*anuppabandhena*), we deduce from that that a single mind lasts for a long time (*ciraṃ).*

4. The clear realization (*abhisamaya*) of the Fruits and the truths is gradual (*anupubba*).[292]

It is said in the Suttas: "Just as, O monks, the great Ocean (*mahāsamudda*) gets progressively deeper (*anupubbaninna*), progressively sloping (*anupubbapabbhāra*) and does not fall away (*papāta*) abruptly *(āyatakena*), so, O monks, in regard to the Dharma and discipline (*dhammavinaya*), there is progressive study (*anupubbasikkhā),* progressive accomplishment (*anupubbakiriyā),* progressive method (*anupubbapaṭipadā),* and not sudden penetration of supreme knowledge *(āyatakeneva aññaṭivedha*)," and also : "The clever (*medhāvī*) goldsmith (*kammāra*) removes (*niddhamme*) the impurity (*mala*) from the silver (*rajata*) progressively (*anupubbena*), little by little (*thokaṃ thokaṃ),* from one moment to the next (*khaṇe khaṇe*)", and also: "The one who sees (*passati*) suffering (*dukkha*) sees the very origin of suffering (*dukkhasamudayampi*), sees the very cessation of suffering (*dukkhanirodhampi*), sees the very path that leads to the cessation of suffering (*dukkhanirodhagāminīpaṭipadampi*). The one who sees the origin of suffering sees the very suffering, see the very path that leads to the cessation of suffering. The one who sees the cessation of suffering sees the very suffering, sees the origin of suffering, sees the very path that leads to cessation of suffering. The one who sees the path that leads to the cessation of suffering sees the very suffering, sees the origin of suffering, sees the very cessation of suffering."

5. The speech (*vohāra*) of the Buddha Bhagavant is supramundane (*lokuttara*). [293]

This thesis is clearly Lokottaravadin.

6. There are two (*dve*) cessations (*nirodha*) which are non-conditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[294]

These two cessations, both non-conditioned (*asaṇkhata*), are the cessation without discriminating knowledge (*appaṭisaṇkhānirodha*) and the cessation by means of discriminating knowledge (*paṭisaṇkhānirodha*).

7. The power (*bala*) of the Tathāgata is shared (*sādhāraṇa*) by the Listeners (*sāvaka*).[295]

By holding this thesis, the Andhakas base themselves on Suttas whose meaning is not clear.

8. The power (*bala*) of the Tathāgata, which is the true (*yathābhūta*) knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of conclusions based on well-founded and non-well-founded *(ṭhānāṭhāna*) conclusions, is noble (*ariya*). More generally: the ten powers of the Tathāgata, comsisting of true knowledges, are noble.[296]

No justification for this thesis is cited by Buddhaghosa.

9. The mind (*citta*) without passions (*sarāga*) is liberated (*vimuccati*). <91>[297]

Just as a soiled (*malīna*) garment (*vattha*) when washed (*dhoviyamāna*) is rid (*vimuccati*) of its stains (*mala*), so the mind provided with passions is freed form passions (*rāga*). Just as, by washing a garment

[292] Ibid., II, 9.
[293] Ibid., II, 10.
[294] Ibid., II, 11.
[295] Ibid., III, 1.
[296] Ibid., III, 2.
[297] Ibid., III, 3.

that does not have stains, one cannot rid the garment of stains that it does not have, so one cannot free a pure mind of the passions that it does not have.

10. In the eighth (*aṭṭhamaka*) individual (*puggala*), obsession with heresies (*diṭṭhipariyuṭṭhāna*) and obsession with doubt (*vicikicchāparityṭṭhāna*) are abandoned (*pahīna*).[298]

The eighth individual is the person who is a Stream-enterer (*sotāpattimaggaṭṭha*), the lowest stage of sainthood. Being on the point of being converted, of entering into the stream of religious life and having already left the worldly life, he abandons the first two corruptions, the ones that characterize worldly people and heretics.

11. In the eighth (*aṭṭhamaka*) individual (*puggala*), there is no faculty of faith (*saddhindriya*) or any of the other four holy faculties of exertion (*viriya*), mindfulness (*sati*), meditation (*samādhi*) or wisdom (*paññā*), even though he does possess faith, exertion, mindfulness, meditation and wisdom.[299]

Buddhaghosa does not note the argumentation by which the Andhakas held this thesis.

12. The divine eye (*dibbacakkhu*) is the fleshly eye (*maṃsacakkhu*) based on things (*dhammūpatthaddha*). [300]

The divine eye is the supernatural faculty by which the Buddha sees (*passati*), i.e., cognizes the lives of all beings. Buddhaghosa does not mention the argumentation used by the Andhakas on this subject.

13. There is perception (*saññā)* among the Non-Perceiving beings (*asaññasatta*).[301]

The Non-Perceiving beings are the gods (*deva*) of the fourth realm of form (*rupāvacara*) corresponding to the fourth trance (*catutthajjhāna*). According to a Sutta, there is perception in the Non-Perceiving beings at the time of their rebirth and at their death (*cutipaṭisandhikkhaṇe*).

14. It should not be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that there is perception (*saññā)* in the realm of neither perception nor non-perception (*nevasaññānāsaññāyatana*).[302]

15. The Bodhisatta, the future Buddha, became a practitioner of celibacy (*caritabrahmacariya*) and was brought to the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*okkantaniyāma*) thanks to the sermons of the Bhagavant Kassapa, a previous Buddha.[303]

This thesis is based on the Suttas in which the Buddha acknowledges having been the disciple of this Kassapa who initiated him into the holy life and brought him to complete enlightenment by his own power.

16. The individual (*puggala*) who has attained (*paṭipanna*) the realization of sainthood (*arahattasacchikiriyā)* is endowed (*samannāgata*) with the three lower fruits (*phala*).[304]

Actually, the individual who has attained sainthood has already obtained <92> (*paṭiladdha*) the three lower fruits and, since he obviously has not abandoned (*aparihīna*) them, he is therefore endowed with them. It is

[298] Ibid., III, 5.
[299] Ibid., III, 6.
[300] Ibid., III, 7.
[301] Ibid., III, 11.
[302] Ibid., III, 12.
[303] Ibid., IV, 8.
[304] Ibid., IV, 9. Thesis of some Andhakas.

the same for the individuals who have attained the realization of the second and third stages of sainthood, who are endowed with the fruits of their lower stages.

17. Sainthood (*arahatta*) is the abandonment (*pahāna*) of all the fetters (*sabbasaññojana*).[305]

No proof of this thesis is mentioned by Buddhaghosa.

18. He who possesses the knowledge of deliverance (*vimuttiñāṇa*) is delivered (*vimutta*).[306]

The explanation of this thesis by Buddhaghosa is not clear.

19. The absorption (*samāpatti*) based on earth (*paṭhavīkasiṇa*) produces an erroneous (*viparīta*) knowledge (*ñāṇa*).[307]

The earth *kasiṇa*, used for the purpose of entering into meditation, consists of taking a piece of earth and, by absorption, seeing nothing but earth in the entire universe. As this vision does not correspond to reality, the earth *kasiṇa* therefore produces a false knowledge.

20. Every (*sabba*) knowledge (*ñaṇa*) is analytical knowledge (*paṭisambhidā).*

All knowledge is supramundane (*lokuttara*) wisdom (*paññā*) and consequently analytical knowledge.

21. It should not be said (*na vattabba*) that relative knowledge (*sammatiñaṇa*) has as object only the Truth (*saccārammaṇaññeva*) and no other object (*na aññarammaṇa*).[308]

There are two truths, the relative truth (*sammatisacca*) and the absolute truth (*paramattḥasacca*). No proof of this thesis is given by Buddhaghosa.

22. The knowledge (*ñaṇa*) of the modes of another's thinking (*cetopariyāya*) has as object only the mind (*cittārammaṇaññeva*) and not any other object (*na aññarammaṇa*).[309]

No proof of this thesis is givenm by Buddhaghosa.

23. The knowledge (*ñaṇa*) of the future (*anāgata*) exists (*atthi*).[310]

This proposition is deduced from the fact that in some Suttas the Buddha predicts the future, thus proving that there exists, for him at least, some knowledge of the future.

24. The knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the present (*paccuppanna*) exists (*atthi*).[311]

This thesis is established on the fact that in some Suttas, a certain knowledge of the present is affirmed. In particular, since all the formations (*sabbasaṇkhāra*) are seen (*diṭṭha*) as impermanent (*anicca*), the knowledge that one has of them is also impermanent and concerns the present.

25. In the Listener (*sāvaka*), there is a knowledge concerning the fruit (*phala*).[312] <93>

The Buddhas teach (*desenti*) the Dharma of the production (*uppatti*) of the noble Fruits (*ariyaphala*) of beings (*satta*), but the Listeners do so also (*sāvakāpti*). Consequently, in the Listeners, just as in the Buddhas (*sāmaññena buddhānaṃ viya*), there is knowledge about the fruit that can be acquired by a given being.

---

[305] Ibid., IV, 10. Thesis of some Andhakas.
[306] Ibid., V, 1.
[307] Ibid., V, 3,
[308] Ibid., V, 6. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, chap.VII, especially p. 15 n. 4.
[309] Ibid., V, 7. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, chap.VII, especially p. 15 n. 6.
[310] Ibid., V, 8
[311] Ibid., V, 9.
[312] Ibid., V, 10.

26. Assurance of the eventual establishment in enlightenment (*niyāma*) is unconditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[313]

Since the person who is capable (*bhabba*) of entering (*okkamituṃ*) into the assurance of eventual enlightenment is, by this fact, established in the correctness (*sammatta*) in good (*kusala*) dharmas, the assurance is called (*vuccati*) the noble Path (*ariyamagga*). Since the person (*puggala*) who is reborn (*uppajjitvā)* there is not called (*nāma*) 'non-established (*aniyata*) in regards to what has ceased (*niroddha*)', the assurance is said to be non-conditioned in the permanent (*niccaṭṭhena*) sense.

27. The absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*) is non-conditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[314]

The absorption of cessation is one of the highest stages of meditation. When it has been attained, there is no further functioning (*appavatti*) of the four aggregates (*khanda*). Since it does not show the characteristics of composite phenomena (*saṇkhatalakkhaṇa*), it is therefore non-conditioned.

28. Space *(ākāsa*) is visible (*sanidassana*).[315]

We see (*passati*) an interval (*antara*) between two trees (*rukkha*) or between two pillars (*thambha*), we see through a key-hole (*tālachidda*) or the opening of a window (*vātapānachidda*), therefore space is visible.

29. The earth element (*paṭhavīdhātu*), the water element *(āpodhātu*), the fire element (*tejodhātu*) and the wind element (*vāyodhātu*) are visible (*sanidassana*).[316]

We see (*passati*) the soil (*bhūmi*), a rock (*pāsāṇa*), a mountain (*pabbata*), therefore the earth element is visible. We see water (*udaka*), therefore the liquid element is visible. We see the fire (*aggi*) and the flame (*jalanta*), therefore the fire element is visible. We see the trees (*rukkha*) shake (*sañcāliyamāna*) under the influence of the wind (*vāta*), therefore the wind element is visible.

30. Earth (*paṭhavī*) is maturation of action (*kammavipāka*).[317]

Since an action (*kamma*) leading to suzerainty (*issariyasaṃvattaniya*) and an action leading to supremacy (*adhipaccasaṃvattaniya*) exist, and since suzerainty and supremacy are exerted in relation to the earth, the latter is therefore maturation of action.

31. Old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*) are maturation (*vipāka*).[318]

Since an action leading to ugliness (*dubbaṇṇasaṃvattaniya*) and an action leading to the shortening of life (*appāyukasaṃvattaniya*) exist, i.e., the one leading to old age and the other to death, the latter are therefore maturation of action.

32. There is no maturation (*vipāka*) of noble things (*ariyadhamma*).[319]

Noble things are those concerning the Path (*maggasaṇkhāta*), in particular, the Fruits of the religious life (*sāmaññaphala*). But these are only the abandoning of the fetters (*kilesappahānamattameva*) and are neither mind <94> (*citta*) nor mental events (*cetasiks dhamma*). Therefore they are not maturation.

---

[313] Ibid., VI, 1.
[314] Ibid., VI, 5.
[315] Ibid., VI, 7.
[316] Ibid., VI, 8.
[317] Ibid., VII, 7.
[318] Ibid., VII, 8.
[319] Ibid., VII, 9

33. Maturation (*vipāka*) is a phenomenon of the law of maturation (*vipākadharmmadhamma*).[320]

Since the four non-material (*arupī*) aggregates (*khandha*) mutually condition one another (*aññamaññapaccaya*), are maturation and are phenomena of the law of maturation, therefore maturation is a phenomenon of the law of maturation.

34. There are six (*cha*) destinies (*gati*).[321]

In addition to the five hell destinies (*niraya*), destinies of the animals (*tiracchānayoni*), hungry ghosts (*pittivisaya*), humans (*manussa*) and Gods (*deva*), the Andhakas also count that of the Titans (*asura*) which the other sects place among the hungry ghosts.

35. The world of form (*rūpadhātu*) is made up of material (*rūpī*) things (*dhamma*).[322]

No proof of this thesis is given by Buddhaghosa.

36. In the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*), the individual (*attabhāva*) is composed of the six spheres (*saḷāyatanika*).[323]

Basing themselves on the Sutta according to which: "The complete faculty (*ahīnindriya*) provided with all the factors and appendices (*sabbaṅapaccaṇgī*) consisting of mind (*manomaya*) is form (*rūpī*)", the Andhakas deduced therefrom that the Gods of the form realm, the Followers of Brahmā (*brahmakāyika*) and others, were provided with the attributes (*nimitta*) of nose (*ghāṇa*), tongue (*jivhā)* and body (*kāya*) as well as those of the eye (*cakkhu*), ear (*sota*) and mind *(mano*).

37. There is form (*rūpa*) among those of the formless realm (*arūpa*).[324]

Since name and form (*nāmarūpa*), which constitute the individual in his form and formless elements, are conditioned by consciousness (*viññanapaccaya*), even in the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*) there is a subtle substance (*sukhumarūpa*) independent (*anissita*) of coarse substance (*olārikarūpa*).

38. There is abandonment (*pahāna*) of the fetters *(sañño*jana) in the person who sees the benefit *(ānisaṃsadassāvī*).[325]

This concerns the five benefits of morality (*śīla*): great wealth, great fame, self-confidence, a peaceful death and a good rebirth. The Andhakas are relying on a Sutta that says: "O monks (*bhikkhave*), the monk who observes happiness (*sukhānupassati*), who perceives happiness (*sukhasaññi*), who experiences happiness (*sukhapaṭisaṃvedī*), who adheres continuously (*satata*) in his mind (*adhimuccamāna*) to peace (*samita*) and who uninterruptedly (*abbokiṇṇa*) searches for it (*pariyogāhamāṇa*) with his wisdom (*paññ*a), dwells (*viharati*) in Nibbāna."

39. The latent tendencies (*anusaya*) lack an object (*anārammaṇa*).[326]

---

[320] Ibid., VII, 10.
[321] Ibid., VIII, 1.
[322] Ibid., VIII, 5.
[323] Ibid., VIII, 7.
[324] Ibid., VIII, 8.
[325] Ibid., IX, 1.
[326] Ibid., IX, 4.

The worldly person (*puthujjana*) who abides (*vattamāna*) with a good or indeterminate (*kusalābyākata*) mind (*citta*) may be said to be provided with tendencies (*sānusaya*). Since in this case there is no object for the tendencies, the tendencies do not have an object. <95>

40. Consciousness (*ñaṇa*) lacks an object (*anārammaṇa*).[327]

Since the Arahant is endowed with visual consciousness (*cakkuviññaṇasamaṇgī*), he is called a knower (*ñaṇi*). But in him, this consciousness has no object.

41. One is endowed (*samannāgata*) with the past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) as well as the present (*paccuppanna*).[328]

The person who cognizes the eight liberations (*aṭṭhavimokkhañāyī*), who, at will (*nikāmalābhī*), is in possession of the four trances (*jhāna*), possesses (*lābhī*) the nine absorptions of successive abodes (*anupubbavihārasamāpatti*). Therefore he is endowed with both past and future stages of meditation.

42. Since the five aggregates (*khandha)* that are trying to be reborn (*upapattesiya*) have not yet ceased (*aniruddha*), the five active (*kiriya*) aggregates are produced (*uppajjanti*).[329]

The five aggregates trying to be reborn are those that exist at the moment of the breaking up (*bhaṇgakhaṇa*) of the mind of the vital continuum (*bhavaṇgacitta*), i.e., at the precise moment of rebirth. If the mind of the vital continuum had ceased while the new aggregates were not yet produced (*anuppanna*), then there would be (*bhaveyya*) a solution of continuity (*santaviccheda*) in the vital series and the new being would be absolutely different from the old being.

43. By saying (*bhāsata*) the words (*vāca*): "This (*idaṃ)* is suffering (*dukkha*)", the knowledge (*ñaṇa*): "This is suffering" appears (*pavattati*).[330]

44. The stability of things (*dhammaṭṭhitā)* is complete (*parinipphanna*).[331]

Buddhaghosa gives no proof of this thesis.

45. Impermanence (*aniccatā),* old age (*jarā)* and death (*maraṇa*) are complete (*parinipphana*).[332]

Buddhadhosa gives no proof of this thesis.

46. The person who is in absorption (*samāpanna*) savors (*assādeti*), desires, meditation (*jhānanikanti*) and has meditation as object (*jhānārammaṇa*). [333]

This thesis is based on a passage of a Sutta that says: "O monks (*bhikkhave*), the monk (*bhikkhu*) … who has attained (*upasampajja*) the first…, the second…, the third…, the fourth trance (*jhāna*), abides (*viharati*) therein, savors it, desires it."

47. Latent tendencies (*anusaya*) are one thing (*aññа*), manifestly active afflictions (outbursts) (*pariyuṭṭāna*) are another.[334]

---

[327] Ibid., IX, 5.
[328] Ibid., IX, 12.
[329] Ibid., IX, 13.
[330] Ibid., XI, 4.
[331] Ibid., XI, 7.
[332] Ibid., XI, 8.
[333] Ibid., XIII, 7.
[334] Ibid., XIV, 5.

The worldly person (*puthujjana*) who lives (*vattamāna*) with a good or indeterminate (*kusalābhākata*) mind (*citta*) may be said (*vattabba*) to be provided with tendencies (*sānusaya*), but he cannot be said to be obsessed (*pariyuṭṭhita*). Consequently, the manifestly active afflictions (obsessions) are different from the tendencies.

48. The manifestly active affliction (*pariyuṭṭhāna*) is dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*).[335]

49. The desire of form (*rūparāga*) lies (*anuseti*) in the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*), is included in the realm of form (*rūpadhātupariyāpanna*). The desire of the formless (*arūparāga*) lies in the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*), is included in the formless realm (*arūpadhātupariyāpanna*).[336] <96>

This thesis is based by analogy on the thesis, adopted by all the sects, according to which the passion of lust (*kāmarāga*) lies in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) and is included in the desire realm (*kāmadhātupariyāpanna*).

50. Speculative theory (*diṭṭhigata*) is indeterminate (*abyākata*).[337]

This thesis is based on a Sutta recognized by the Theravādins as well, who question it. Actually, the Andhakas have interpreted the word *abyākata* wrongly. When the Buddha says in this Sutta that contradictory speculative theories are indeterminate, he obviously means that they are not definite, that they are illusory, false, and that it is madness to believe in them (see the *Brahmajālasūtra*, recognized by all the sects). The Theravādin criticism proves that the Andhakas gave to the word 'indeterminate' (*abyākata*) the meaning that it generally has in scholastic Buddhism, i.e., neither good (*kusala*) nor bad (*akusala*).

51. Action (*kamma*) is one thing (*aññа*), the accumulation of action (*kammūpacaya*) is another.[338]

No proof of this thesis is given by Buddhaghosa who only mentions that the Andhakas considered the accumulation of actions as different from action (*kammato aññо*), dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*), indeterminate (*abyākata*) and lacking an object (*anārammaṇa*).

52. Form (*rūpa*) is retribution (*vipāka*) of action.[339]

Just as things (*dhamma*) and mental events (*cittacetasika*) are produced (*uppanna*) due to the accomplishing (*katatta*) of action (*kamma*), form (*rūpa*) is produced due to the accomplishment of action.

53. There is form (*rūpa*) in the realm of form (*rūpavacara*) and in the formless realm (*arūpavacara*).[340]

Since the accomplishment (*katatta*) of action (*kamma*) of the desire realm (*kāmavacara*) is form (*rūpa*) of the desire realm, the accomplishment of action of the form realm is form of the form realm and that of the formless realm is that of the form of the formless realm. Therefore there is form in the two higher realms.

---

[335] Ibid., XIV, 6.
[336] Ibid., XIV, 7. See below, thesis 54.
[337] Ibid., XIV, 8.
[338] Ibid., XV, ii. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 242-244.
[339] Ibid., XVI, 8.
[340] Ibid., XVI, 9.

54. Passion for form (*rūparāga*) is included in the form realm (*rūpadhātupariyāpanna*) and passion for the formless (*arūparāga*) is included in the formless realm (*arūpadhatupariyāpanna*). [341]

55. In the Arahant there is accumulation of merit (*puññūpacaya*).[342]

Since the Arahant is able to accomplish good actions (*kamma*) such as distribution of alms (*dānasaṃvibhāga*) or the worship of a shrine (*cetiyavandana*), he accumulates merit.

56. The feces and urine (*uccārapassāva*) of the Buddha Bhagavant greatly (*ativiya*) surpass (*adhiggaṇhāti*) other (*aññā*) perfumes (*gandhajāta*). [343]

Buddhaghosa does not give the proof of this thesis, contenting himself to mentioning that it was the outcome of undue (*ayoniso*) ardor (*pemavasena*) towards the Buddha Bhagavant. <97>

57. The four Fruits of the religious life (*sāmaññaphala*) are realized (*sacchikaroti*) by a single (*eka*) Path.[344]

This thesis is based on the fact recognized by all the sects that the Bhagavant realized the four Fruits successively.

58. One passes (*saṇkamati*) immediately from one meditation (*jhana*) to another meditation.[345]

Some Andhakas held that one passes immediately from one stage of meditation to another without (*vinā)* an intermediate stage of access (*upacārappavatti*).

59. There are intermediate stages between the meditations (*jhānatarika*).[346]

Other Andhakas than the preceding ones think, on the contrary, that there are intermediate stages between some consecutive stages of meditation.

60. Emptiness (*suññatā)* is included in the aggregate of mental formations (*saṇkhārakkhandhapariyāpanna*).[347]

There are two types of emptiness recognized by the Hinayāna: the first concerns the characteristic of non-self (*anattalakkhaṇa*) of the aggregates (*khandha*), the second concerns the empty aspect of *nibbāṇa*. Here it is a matter of the first type. This thesis is based on the Sutta: "O monks, in the mental formations it is the emptiness (*suññamidaṃ)* in regard to the self (*atta*) and what belongs to the self (*attaniya*)."

61. The element of extinction (*nibbānadhātu*) is good (*kusala*).[348]

The element of extinction, being regarded as perfect (*anavajja*), is therefore good. This proves that, among the Andhakas, the word *kusala*, 'good', had a less restricted meaning than among the Theravādins. For the latter, that which produces a desirable maturation (*iṭṭhavipāka*) is 'good'.

62. There are no hell guards (*nirayapāla*) in the hells (*niraya*).[349]

---

[341] Ibid., XVI, 10. See above thesis 49. Same proof.
[342] Ibid., XVI(I, 1.
[343] Ibid., XVIII, 4. Thesis of some Andhakas.
[344] Ibid., XVIII, 5. See above thesis 16. Thesis held by somne Andhakas.
[345] Ibid., XVIII, 6. Thesis held by some Andhakas.
[346] Ibid., XVIII, 7. Thesis iof some Andhakas.
[347] Ibid., XIX, 2.
[348] Ibid., XIX, 6. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, IV, p 33-34; T.S. 1541, p. 632c and 649b; T.S. 1542, p. 697ab and 716c: T.S. 1548, p. 530c and 539b.
[349] Ibid., XX, 3.

It is actions (*kamma*) which, in the form of the hell guardinas (*nirayapālarūpena*), punish (*vadhenti*) beings who fall into the hells (*nerayika*) but there are no beings (*satta*) named (*nāma*) hell guardians.

63. There are animals (*tiracchānagata*) among the Gods (*deva*).[350]

Some Gods of India have animal aspects (*tiracchānavaṇṇa*), such as Erāvaṇa, Indra's elephant (*hatthināga*).

64. There is a supernatural power of intention (*adhippāya iddhi*) among the Buddhas or among the Listeners (*sāvaka*).[351]

Some of the stories of miracles show that the Listeners, like the Buddhas, can accomplish intentional miracles.

65. There is little (*hīna*) difference in superiority (*atirkatā)* between the Buddhas.[352]

The Buddhas show only slight differences (*vemattaka*) amongst themselves in regard to body (*sarīra*), length of life (*ayu*), brilliance (*pabhā),* etc.

66. All *(sabbe*) things (*dhamma*) are established (*niyata*).[353]

Just as form (*rūpa*), etc. is established in the self nature of form, etc. (*rūpādisabhāva*) and does not depart from (*vijahati*) this self nature, so all things are established in their own nature. <98>

67. All (*sabbe*) actions (*kamma*) are established (*niyata*).[354]

This thesis is the corollary of the preceding one. The maturation of actions is established, i.e., determined, by the latter, just as the latter are determined by the circumstances of their accomplishment (*diṭṭhadhammavedaniya*), their self nature being thus fixed.

68. There is a certain (*kiñci*) bond (*sañño jana*) that has not been abandoned (*appahāya*) in full extinction (*parinibbāna*).[355]

The Arahant is completely extinguished (*parinibbāti*) while still possessing a bond which has not yet been abandoned (*appahīnasaññojana*) concerning the objective domain of omniscience (*sabbaññūvisaya*), since he does not know (*janati)* the entire (*sabba*) objective domain of the Buddha's knowledge (*buddhavisaya*).

69. Possessing a good mind (*kusalacitta*), the Arahant is completetly extinguished (*parinibbāyati*).[356]

Since the Arahant who has attained an expanded memory (*sativepullappatta*), an elevated memory (*upaṭṭhiitasati*), who is good *(sata*) and wise (*sampajāna*), is fully extinguished, he is fully extinguished with a good mind.

70. The practice (*dhamma*) of mating (*methuna*) should be practiced (*paṭisevitabba*) with one intention only (*ekadhippāyena*).[357]

---

[350] Ibid. XX, 4.
[351] Ibid., XXI, 4.
[352] Ibid., XXI, 5.
[353] Ibid., XXI, 7.
[354] Ibid., XXXI, 8.
[355] Ibid., XXII, 1. Thesis of some Andhakas.
[356] Ibid., XXII, 2.
[357] Ibid., XXIII, 1.

According to Buddhaghosa, 'with one intention' means either with compassion (*kāruṇā*) or the vow (*paṇidhi*): "May we be reborn (*bhavissāma*) together (*ekato*) in the cycle of rebirths (*samsāra*)" pronounced after having paid homage to the Buddha (*buddhapūjā)* with a woman (*itthi*).

71. The Bodhisatta goes (*gacchati*) into an unfortunate (*vinipāta*) destiny with the view of realizing his sovereign desire (*issariyakāmakārikāhetu*).[358]

This thesis is based on the *Chaddanta-Jātaka*, which gives an example of this order. The Andhakas likewise maintained, for the same reasons, that the Bodhisatta, with the view of realizing his sovereign desire, descends (*okkamati*) into a womb (*gabbhaseyya*), has performed (*akāsi*) misdeeds (*dukkarakārikā),* has done ill to another (*aparantapa*), has referred (*uddisi)* to another (*aññā*) master (*satthāraṃ)* and has proposed heretical theses.

72. There are non-passions (*na rāga*) resembling passion (*rāgapaṭirūpaka*).[359]

Thus, loving-kindness (*mettā),* compassion (*karuṇā)* and joy (*muditā)* resemble the passions and yet are not passions. <99>

[358] Ibid., XXIII, 3.
[359] Ibid., XXIII, 4.

CHAPTER IX

The Pūrvaśailas or Uttaraśailas

This sect is unknown to the Sammatīya tradition cited by Bhavya, and the Ceylonese *Chronicles* do not place them in the chart of the relationship of the sects but rather in a group of six schools of late appearance. The *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra* and Vasumitra are aware of them and place them beside the Caitīyas and the Aparaśailas among the latest shools of the Mahāsānghikas. The Mahāsāṇghika list cited by Bhavya as well as by Vinītadeva places them among the Mahāsāṇghikas beside the Aparaśailas. Buddhaghosa makes them one of the four Andhaka sects.

According to Vasumitra and his commentators K'ouei-ki and Paramārtha,[360] the Pūrvaśailas or rather the Uttaraśailas - for that is the name by which they knew them - appeared at the beginning of the 3rd century after the Nirvāṇa i.e., about 260 B.C.E. at the beginning of Aśoka's reign, the Nirvāṇa having occurred about 480 B.C.E. Like the Caitīyas, to whom they are closely related and from whom they are definitely derived, they appeared after the schism provoked by the second Mahādeva among the Mahāsāṇghikas, and withdrew with them to a mountainous land which is not specified.

An inscription dated at the 14th year of Māṭharīputa, an Ikṣvāku king, thus of the 3rd century C.E., at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, mentions them.[361] This confirms the information derived from other sources. Buddhaghosa considers them to be an Andhaka sect,[362] thus of this region. Hiuan-tsang found the Pūrvaśilā monastery on a mountain east of Dhaṇyakaṭaka and notes the past grandeur of this Buddhist centre where he still found 1000 Mahāsāṇghika monks distributed among 20 monasteries.[363] Finally, at Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa in inscriptions of the 2nd and 3rd centuries C.E., traces were found of the presence of the Caitīyas and Aparaśailas to whom the Pūrvaśailas were closely related. As the *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra* and Vasumitra knew them under the name of Uttaraśaila, it is possible that the monastery freom which they took their name and origin had been built on a rock (*śilā*) situated northwest (*uttarapurva*) of Dhaṇyakaṭaka or Amarāvatī.

Taranātha notes that at the time of Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti, thus in the 7th century C.E., the Pūrvaśailas had disappeared.[364] Hiuan-tsang testifies that at the beginning of the 7th century, the Pūrvaśilā monstery had been deserted for more than 100 years.

Chapter IX
[360] K'ouei-ki, I, p. 45ab; Demiéville, *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 22 and 54.
[361] H. Sastri: *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XX, 1929-30, p. 23.
[362] *Kathāvatthu*, I, 9.
[363] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels*, II, p. 214, 215.
[364] Schiefner: Tāranātha, p. 175.

It seems that the Pūrvaśailas had been the most important of the Andhaka sects, for Buddhaghosa attributes to them no less than 31 heresies denounced by the <100> *Kathāvatthu*. According to Vasumitra, most of their theses were identical with those of the Mahāsāṇghikas. Here are the theses they are thought to have upheld:

1. The Bodhisattvas are not freed (*vimukta*) from the bad destinies (*durgati*).[365]

According to K'ouei-ki, not yet having attained the stage of presentiment (*kṣānti*), the Bodhisattvas are like worldly people (*pṛthagjana*) and this is why they are not free of the bad destinies.[366]

2. The worship (*pūjā)* of a reliquary (*stūpa*) or a shrine (*caitya*) does not produce a great fruit (*mahāphala*).[367]

K'ouei-ki explains that the reliquary and the shrine, being lifeless things, cannot experience the benefit of the generosity made to them, but it is the donor himself who rouses within himself joyous minds. This is why this worship is able to produce, not a great fruit, but just a little bit of happiness.

3. In the Arahant there is impure seminal emission (*asucisukkavisaṭṭhi*).[368]

4. The Arahant has ignorance (*aññaṇa*).[369]

5. The Arahant has doubts (*kaṇkhā)*.[370]

6. The Arahant is saved by another (*paravitāraṇa*)[371]

7. The person who is in absorption (*samāpanna*) speaks words (*vacībheda*).[372]

8. The nutrient suffering (*dukkhāhāra*) is a member of the Path *(maggaṇga*) and included in the Path (*maggapariyāpanna*).[373]

9. Dependent origination (*paṭiccasamuppāda*) is unconditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[374]

The Blessed One said: "Because of birth *(jātipaccayā),* O monks, there is old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*). Whether the Tathāgata appears (*uppādā)* or does not appear, this element (*dhātu*) is stable *(ṭhitāva*), this stability of things (*dhammaṭṭhitatā),* this certainty of things (*dhammaniyāmatā),* this conditioning by something (*idappaccayatā)*... This absence of change (*avitathatā),* this absence of alteration (*anañňathatā),* this conditioning by something, is suchness (*tathatā)*; this is what is called dependent origination." Being stable in essence, dependent origination is therefore unnconditioned.

10. The four truths (*sacca*) are unconditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[375]

---

[365] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Vinītadeva, thesis 1. *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 3, attributed to the Andhakas, thus to the Pūrvaśailas. See above, thesis 71 0f the Andhakas.
[366] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 10a.
[367] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 2. The Chinese versions translate *stūpa*, the Tibetan versions, *caitya*.
[368] *Kathāvatthu*, II, 1. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas; Vasumitra, thesis 3.
[369] Ibid., II, 2. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas; Vasumitra, thesis 3.
[370] Ibid., II, 3. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas; Vasunitra, thesis 3.
[371] Ibid., II, 4. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas; Vasumitra thesis 3.
[372] Ibid., II, 5. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṅghikas; Vasumitra thesis 3.
[373] Ibid., II, 6.
[374] Ibid., VI, 2.
[375] Ibid., Vi, 3.

The Blessed One said: "O monks, there are four things that are identical to themselves, unchanging, unaltered. – What are these four things? – Suffering, O monks, is identical with itself, unchanging, unaltered. The origin of suffering… The cessation of suffering… The path that leads to the cessation of suffering is identical with itself, unchanging, unaltered. Such, O monks are the four things…" <101>

11. The intermediary existence (*antarābhava*) exists.[376]

12. Since there exists a category of individuals who are completely extinguished in the interval (*antarāparinibbāyipuggala*), there is an intermediary existence between death and the following rebirth.

12. The five qualities of desire (*kāmaguṇa*) belong to the realm of desire (*kāmadhātu*).[377]

This thesis is based on the Sutta in which the Buddha taught that the five qualities of desire, i.e., forms (*rūpa*) cognizable by the eye (*cakkhuviññeyya*), sounds (*sadda*) cognizable by the ear (*sotaviññeya*), smells (*gandha*) cognizable by the nose (*ghānaviññeya*), tastes (*rasa*) cognizable by the tongue (*jivhāviññeyya*) and tangibles (*phoṭṭhabba*) cognizable by the body (*kāyaviññeyya*), are desirable (*iṭṭha*), lovable (*kanta*), attractive (*manāpa*), pleasant (*piyarūpa*), accompanied by desire (*kāmūpasaṃhita*), sweet (*rajaniya*).

13. The five spheres *(āyatana*) are desire (*kāma*).[378]

This thesis is a corollary of the preceding one and is based on the same Sutta.

14.There is no substantial (*rūpa*) vital faculty (*jīvitindriya*).[379]

15. Because of his actions (*kammahetu*), the Arahant falls (*parihāyati*) from sainthood (*arahatta*).[380]

The Arahant who has slandered (*abbhāvikkhati*) other Arahants in a previous lifetime (*purimabhava*) falls from the state of Arahant because of this action.

16. That which has as object the immortal (*amatārammaṇa*) is a fetter (*saññojana*).[381]

This thesis rests on the teaching of the Buddha according to which, having perceived (*sañjānitvā) nibbana*, one pictures it (*maññati*) and one is delighted (*abhinandati*) in it, the immortal (*amata*) being *nibbana*. Since one delights in the immortal, the fact of having it as object develops a passion for it, therefore a fetter.

17. Sound (*sadda*) is the diffusion of conceptuality (*vitakkavipphāra*) everywhere (*sabbaso*) after reasoning (*virakkayato*) and after analysis (*vicārayato*).[382]

Since conceptualization (*vitakka*) and analysis (*vicāra*) are called (*vutta*) conditions necessary for language (*vacīsaṇkhāra*), sound is the diffusion everywhere of conceptuality after reasoning and analysis, from the end (*antamaso*) of the latter to the very moment when the mental element enters into action (*manodhātupavattikālepi*).

18. Speech (*vācā)* is not in accord with the mind (*yathācitta*).[383]

---

[376] Ibid., VIII, 2.
[377] Ibid., VIII, 3.
[378] Ibid., VIII, 4.
[379] Ibid., VIII, 10.
[380] Ibid., VIII, 11.
[381] Ibid., IX, 2.
[382] Ibid. IX, 9.

Since one says: "I will proclaim (*bhaṇissāmi*) such and such a thing (*aññha*)" and one proclaims (*bhaṇāti*) something else (*aññha*), and since one says: "I will tell such and such a thing (*kathessāmi*)" and one tells (*katheti*) something else, etc…, speech neither is in accord with the mind nor does it correspond to the mind (*cittānurūpa*) nor is it dependent on the mind (*cittānugatika*), and it functions (*pavattati*) without (*vinā)* mind (*citta*).

19. Physical action (*kāyakamma*) does not conform to the mind (*yathācitta*).[384] <102>

This thesis is parallel to the preceding one. Since one says: "I will go (*gacchissāmi*) to such and such a place (*aññatra*)", and one goes someplace else (*aññatra*), and since one says: "I will throw (*pasāressāmi*) such and such a thing", and one throws something else (*aññha*), physical action is not in conformity with the mind nor does it correspond to the mind (*cittānurūpa*) nor is it in dependence on the mind (*cittānugatika*) and it functions (*pavattati*) without (*vinā)* mind (*citta*).

20. Consciouness (*ñaṇa*) is disscociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*).[385]

Since the Arahant must be called (*vattabba*) a knower (*ñaṇī)* because he is endowed with visual consciousness, etc. (*cakkhuviññaṇādisamaṇgī*), and since this consciousness which is, moreover, consciousness of the Path (*maggañaṇa*) is not associated (*sampayutta*) with the mind (*citta*), consciousness is therefore dissociated from the mind.

21. The individual (*puggala*) endowed with right view (*diṭṭhisampanna*) can intentionally (*sañcicca*) deprive (*voropeyya*) a living being (*pāṇa*) of its life (*jīvitā).*[386]

Since there is the killing of a living being (*pāṇātipāta*) because of a mind associated with hatred (*dosasampayuttacitta*) and hatred has not been abandoned (*appahīna*) in the person endowed with right view, the latter can intentionally kill a living being.

22. The person who is affirmed in the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*niyata*) enters (*okkamati*) into affirmation (*niyāma*).[387]

There are two determinate states, i.e., states where the maturation is determined: determination on falsehood (*micchattaniyama*) resulting from unpardonable action (*anantariyakamma*) and the determination on correctness (*sammattaniyama*) which is the noble Path (*ariyamagga*). The Pubbaseliyas allude to another determination not recognoized by the Theravādins. Actually, the Buddhas can know, by means of their own power of consciousness (*ñaṇabala*), that such and such a being (*satta*) will attain (*pāpuṇissati*) awakening (*bodhi*) in the future (*anāgata*), and it is said: "The Bodhisatta is confirmed in the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*niyata*) due to the excellence of his own merit *(puññussadattā*)." Now the Bodhisatta who has come to his last lifetime (*pacchimabhava*), who is already fixed from this point of view, is able (*bhabba*) to understand completely (*abhisametuṃ*) [the Dharma] from the time of this birth (*jāti*) and thus is able to enter into the determination on correctness.

23. The craving for mental phenomena (*dhammataṇhā)* is indeterminate (*abyākata*).[388]

---

[383] Ibid., IX, 10.
[384] Ibid., IX, 11.
[385] Ibid., XI, 3.
[386] Ibid., XII, 7.
[387] Ibid., XIII, 4.

Buddhaghosa does not mention the proof of this thesis. We may assume that the craving for mental phenomena, which are the objects belonging to the mental element (*manodhātu*), is indeterminate, i.e., neither good (*kusala*) nor bad (*akusala*), therefore it does not produce any fruit (*phala*) because it is not bad like the craving for the five sense objects, forms, sounds, smells, tastes and tangibles which attach one to the world, nor good like the Path of deliverance.

24. The craving for mental phenomena (*dhammataṇhā)* is not the origin of suffering (*dukkhasamudaya*).[389]

This thesis is a corollary of the preceding one. Buddhaghosa does not mention any proof. <103>

25. The six sense spheres (*saḷāyatana*) are established (*saṇṭhāti*) in the mother's womb (*mātukucchi*) simultaneously (*apubbaṃ acarimaṃ).*[390]

From the moment of the reincarnation (*paṭisandhikkhaṇeyeva*) within the mother's womb, the six sense spheres exist in the state of seed (*vījamatta*) just like the bud (*aṇkura*) of a tree (*rukkha*) with its branches and its forks (*sampannasākhāviṭapa*).

26. Speculative theory (*diṭṭhigata*) is not included (*apariyāpanna*) in the world.[391]

Since the worldly person (*puthujjana*) who has acquired the trance state (*jhānalābha*) may be said (*vattabba*) to be rid of the passions (*vītarāga*) and desire (*kāma*) while he is not yet rid of speculative theories (*na vigatadiṭṭhi*), speculative theories are therefore not included in the world.

27. Having completely understood (*adhiggayha*), one pays attention (*manasi karoti*).[392]

This thesis rests on the words of the Buddha: "Everything (*sabbe*) conditioned (*saṇkhāra*) is impermanent (*anicca*)… is suffering *(dukkha*)… is without a self (*anatta*). When one sees (*passati*) this by means of wisdom (*paññña*), one is disgusted (*nibbindati*) with suffering. This is the path (*magga*) of purity (*visuddhi*)." According to Buddhaghosa, attention (*manasikāra*) is the mind practice consisting of imprinting in one's mind the truths concerning the nature of impermanence, etc., of the conditioned. Buddhaghosa glosses *adhiggayha* as *saṇaḥitvā,* 'having understood', having grasped by means of wisdom.

28. The person in absorption (*samāpanna*) hears (*suṇāti*) sound (*sadda*).[393]

The Buddha said: "For the person who is in the first trance state (*jhāna*), sound is a thorn (*kaṇṭaka*)." If the person who is in absorption cannot hear it (*taṃ na sunneyya*), how could (*siyā)* sound be a thorn? This is why the person who is in absorption hears sound.

29. The Fruit of the religious life (*sāmañña phala*) is unconditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[394]

30. Acquisition (*patti*) is unconditioned (*asaṇkhata*).[395]

Acquisition which does not enter into any of the five aggregates is not conditioned (*saṇkhata*).

31. Supraworldly (*lokuttara*) knowledge (*ñaṇa*) has twelve objects (*dvādasavatthuka*).[396]

---

[388] Ibid., XIII, 9.
[389] Ibid., XIII, 10.
[390] Ibid., XIV, 2.
[391] Ibid., XIV, 9.
[392] Ibid., XVI, 4.
[393] Ibid., XVIII, 8.
[394] Ibid., XIX, 3.
[395] Ibid., XIX, 4.

The knowledge taught by the Buddha from the setting into motion of the wheel of Dharma (*dhammacakkappavattana*), which is the supramundane knowledge, is knowledge of twelve aspects (*dvādasākāraññāṇa*).

32. Everything (*sabbe dhamma*) lasts for only a single instant of mind (*ekacittakkhaṇika*).[397] Since everything conditioned (*saṇkhatadhamma*) is impermanent (*anicca*), it lasts for only a single moment of mind since, because of impermanence (*aniccatā),* what is the difference (*visesa*) between a thing that is quickly (*lahum*) destroyed *(bhijjati*) and a thing that lasts for a long time (*cirena*)? <103>

[396] Ibid., XX, 6. See L.P.V.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 246 seq.
[397] Ibid., XXII, 8.

CHAPTER X

The Aparaśailas

This sect was unknown to the Sammatīya tradition cited by Bhavya, and the Ceylonese *Chronicles* do not place it in the chart of the relationships of the sects but rather in a group of six late-appearing schools. Vasumitra places it beside the Caitīyas and the Uttaraśailas among the latest schools of the Mahāsāṇghikas, at least in the most recent versions, for Paramārtha's list is not aware of it. The Mahāsāṇghika list cited by Bhavya and Vinītadeva places it among the Mahāsāṇghikas beside the Pūrvaśailas. Buddhaghosa makes it one of the four Andhaka sects.

Paramārtha does not speak about the Aparaśailas in his commentary on Vasumitra. The little that K'ouei-ki says does not tell us anything about them.[398] We may consider them most likely a school of the Pūrvaśailas, that is if they are distinct from them, since all the theses attributed to them by the various sources are shared by both sects. They seem to have appeared in the second half of the 3rd century C.E. at the earliest.

Several inscriptions attest to their presence at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa during the Ikṣvaku dynasty, thus in the 3rd century of our era.[399] This confirms the information given by other sources. Buddhaghosa considers them as an Andhaka[400] sect, therefore of this region. Hiuan-tsang found the monastery of the Aparaśilā on a mountain west of Dhaṇyakaṭaka, but it had been already deserted for more than 100 years.[401]

Tāranātha notes that at the time of Dharmapāla and Dharmakīrti, thus in the 7th century of our era, the Aparaśailas had disappeared.[402]

An inscription at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa gives us a glimpse of their canonical literature by mentioning, beside their name, the *Dīghanikāya*, *Majjhimanikāya* and *Saṃyuttanikāya* as well as five *Mātukas*.[403] We may note that the divisions of their *Sutrapiṭaka* were called by the name of *nikāya* like those of the Theravādins of Ceylon, not by the name of *āgama* as in the north-west. Dutt assumes that the five *Mātukas* were summaries of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, for the Mahāsāṇghika *Vinayapiṭaka* was in five parts.[404] It is not very likely that, in the 3rd century of our era, the *Vinaya* of this sect still existed in the form of five separate summaries. It is more likely that they were, on the other hand, summaries of the *Abhidharma*, the basket which all the sects <105> rather belatedly collected and which, we know, remained for a long time in the form of separate *mātṛkās*.

Chapter X
[398] K'ouei-ki, I, p. 45b.
[399] H. Sastri: *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XX, 11929-39, p. 17, 20, 22. Ibid., vol. XXI, 1931, p. 66.
[400] *Kathāvatthu*, I, 9.
[401] Watters: *On Yuan chwang's travels*, II, p. 214-214.
[402] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 175.
[403] H. Sastri: Op. cit., vol. XX, p. 17 and 20.
[404] *Early monastic Buddhism*, II, p. 55-56.

Vasumitra notes that most of the Aparaśaila theses, like those of the Uttaraśailas and the Caitīyas which he does not distinguish, were similar to those of the Mahāsāṇghikas. Here are these theses:

1. The Bodhisattvas are not freed (*vimukta*) from the bad destinies (*durgati*).[405]

2. Worship (*pūjā)* of a reliquary (*stūpa*) or a shrine (*caitya*) does not produce a great fruit (*mahāphala*).[406]

3. In the Arahant there is impure emission of semen (*asucisukkavisaṭṭhi*).[407]

4. The Arahant has ignorance (*ajñāṇa*).[408]

5. The Arahant has doubts (*kāṇkṣā).*[409]

6. The Arahant is saved by another (*paravitāraṇa*).[410]

7. The person who is in absorption (*samāpanna*) speaks words (*vacībheda*).[411]

8. The person who is assured of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*niyata*) enters (*okkamati*) into assurance (*niyāma*).[412]

9. The six sense spheres (*saḷāyatana*) are established (*saṇthāti*) in the mother's womb (*mātukucchi*) simultaneously (*apubbaṃ acarimaṃ*).[413]

10. Supramundane (*lokuttara*) knowledge (*ñaṇa*) has twelve objects (*dvādasavatthuka*).[414]

11. Everything (*sabbe dhamma*) lasts only for a single moment of mind (*ekacittakkhaṇika*). [415] <106>

[405] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Vinītadeva, thesis 1; *Kathāvatthu*, XXIII, 3, attributed to the Andhakas then to the Aparaśailas. See above, thesis 71 of the Andhakas and thesis 1 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[406] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 2. See above thesis 2 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[407] Kathāvatthu, II, 1; Vasumitra, thesis 3. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[408] Vasumitra, thesis 3. See above thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[409] Vasumitra, thesis 3.
[410] Vasumitra, thesis 3.
[411] Vasumitra, thesis 3.
[412] *Kathāvatthu*, XIII, 4. See thesis 22 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[413] Ibid., XIV, 2. See thesis 25 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[414] Ibid., XX, 6. See thesis 31 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[415] Ibid., XXII, 8. See thesis 32 of the Pūrvasailas.

CHAPTER XI

The Rājagirīyas

They are known only to Buddhaghosa who made of them one of the four Andhaka sects, and to the Mahāsāṇghika list cited by Bhavya who places them among the Mahāsāghikas They may be considered to be a late sect of the Mahāsāghiaks settled around Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa.[416]

Their name alludes to a 'mountain of the king' (*rājagiri*) on which the first monastery of the sect was probably established and which was likely near Amarāvatī.

Since Buddhaghosa knew of them, the Rājagirīyas existed before the 5th century of our era. Since Buddhaghosa atrtributed to them several heresies denounced in the VIIth part of the *Kathāvatthu*, it seems that their appearance should be pushed back in time, perhaps even as far as the lst century before our era.

Here are their theses:

1. There are no things (*dhamma*) that are included (*saṇgahita*) in other things.[417]

All things are independent of one another. This is the negation of any logical classification of essences and of any systematics. Buddhaghosa does not mention the proof of this proposition.

2. There are no things (*dhamma*) that are associated (*sampayutta*) with other things.[418]

This is a reinforcement of the preceding thesis. Things being absolutely independent, they are not associated into combined actions. Buddhaghosa does not mention the proof of this proposition.

3. There are no mental (*cetasika*) things (*dhamma*).[419]

Mental things are the non-material things which are not mind (*citta*), i.e., the aggregates (*khandha*), sensations (*vedanā),* perceptions (*saññā*) and formations (*saṇkhāra*). Mental things being associated (*sampayutta*) with the mind, if, as in the preceding proposition, there are no things assicated with other things, therefore there are no mental things. This thesis thus seems to be a corollary of the preceding one. Buddhaghosa does not mention the proof.

4. A gift (*dāna*) is a mental (*cetasika*) thing (*dhamma*).[420]

This proposition seems to contradict the preceding one. Buddhaghosa <107> explains that the gift is threefold (*tividha*): the gift made with generous intention (*cāgacetanā*), the gift of abstinence (*virati*), the gift of moral obligation (*deyyadhamma*). The Rājagirīyas maintained that generosity has a desirable fruit (*iṭṭhaphala*), a fruit that one likes (*kantaphala*), a pleasant fruit (*manuññaphala*), a precious fruit

---

Chapter XI

[416] Dutt, *Early monastic Buddhism*, II, p. 52, cites inscriptions mentioned by Burgess (p. 53 and 104) which attest to their presence in this area.

[417] Kathāvatthu, VII, 1.

[418] Ibid., VII, 2.

[419] Ibid., VII, 3.

[420] Ibid., VII, 4.

(*asecanakaphala*), having a happy outcome *(sukhudraya*), having a happy maturation (*sukhavipāka*). The Bhagavat said: "Generosity is caused by faith (*saddhā),* by good consciousness (*hiriya*), and it is good. These things (*dhamma*) are followed by good men (*sappurisānuyāta*), for the person who honors (*vadanti*) this divine (*diviya*) path (*magga*), because of that, goes (*gacchati*) to the God realm (*devaloka*)." The gift given out of faith and good consciousness is the gift made with generous intention. In another Sutta, the Buddha taught the five great gifts (*mahādana*) which are the gifts of abstinence by means of which one gives (*deti*) to innumerable beings the absence of fear (*abhaya*), the absence of hostility (*avera*) and the absence of malice (*abyāpajja*). These two types of gifts are mental things. The Buddha did not teach the gift out of moral obligation which alone is not mental since it consists of food, drink, garments, etc. Therefore a gift is a mental thing.

5. Merit (*puñña*) is increased (*vaḍḍhati*) by [gifts] consisting of enjoyment (*paribhogamaya*).[421]

The Buddha said: "For those who give (*dadanti*) drink (*papa*), wells (*udapāna*) or asylum (*upassaya*), the merit (*puñña*) increases (*pavaḍḍhati*) by day (*divā),* by night (*ratto*), always (*sadā*)." In another Sutta, the Buddha said: "For the person thanks to whom a monk (*bhikkhu*) enjoys (*paribhuñjamāna*) a garment (*cīvara*), alms food (*pindapāta*), etc., there is the result of merit (*puññābhisanda*), good consequences (*kusalābhisanda*), the food of good fortune (*sukhassāhāra*), a happy outcome (*sukhavipāka*), heaven (*sovagga*), leading to the heavens (*saggasamvattanika*)…" These gifts consisting of joy are gifts of moral obligation (*deyyadhamma*) the existence of which is denied by the preceding thesis. There seems to be a contradiction here.

6. Because of generosity (*dāna*) made here below (*ito*), one is protected (*yāpenti*) above (*tattha*).[422]

The Rājagirīyas based their argumentation on this Sutta: "The deceased (*peta*) rejoice (*anumodanti*) by having gifts (*dāna*) made in their interest (*attano attha*), their minds (*citta*) are cheered (*pasādenti*), they become full of joy (*pīti*), they acquire (*paṭilabhanti*) happiness (*samanassa*)." Elsewhere it is said: "Just as rain (*vuṭṭha*) water (*udaka*) falls (*pavattati*) from above (*uṇṇate*) to below (*ninnaṃ),* so the gift (*dinna*) made here below (*ito*) profits (*upakapatti*) the deceased (*peta*). Just as full (*pūra*) storm clouds (*vārivaha*) fill (*paripurenti*) the ocean (*sāgara*), so the gift made here below profits the deceased, for up above (*tattha*) there is no plowing (*kasī*) (*ittha*), the raising of cattle (*gorakkhā)* is unknown (*na vijjati*) there, there are no [trades] such as (*tādisī*) that of the merchant (*vaṇijjā),* buying and selling (*kayākaya*) of gold (*hiraññā*). The dead (*kālakata*) are protected (*yāpenti*) up above (*tahiṃ)* by generosity made here below." On the other hand, the Buddha recommended to people who want (*icchanti*) a son (*putta*) to make a donation (*dakkhiṇaṃ anuppadassati*) to the deceased. <108>

7. The one who must remain for a cosmic era (*kappaṭṭha*) can last (*tittheyya*) a cosmic era (*kappa*).[423]

---

[421] Ibid., VII, 5.
[422] Ibid., VII, 6.
[423] Ibid., XIII, 1. Thesis belonging to the Rājagirīyas.

The Buddha said: "The heretic (*saṇghabhedaka*) remains for a cosmic era (*kappaṭṭha*) like the damned (*nerayika*) subject to the suffering that follows death (*apāyika*). The one who delights in dissension (*vaggarata*), who abides in breaches of the Dharma (*adhammaṭṭha*) is deprived of spiritual peace (*yogakkhema*). Having divided (*bhetvāna*) the once-united (*samagga*) Community (*saṇgha*), he is tortured (*paccati*) for a cosmic era (*kappa*) in hell (*niraya*)." Therefore he remains in hell for an entire cosmic era (*sakala*).

8. The one who is absorbed (*samāpanna*) in the cessation of perception and sensation (*saññāvedayitanirodha*) can die (*kālaṃ kareyya*).[424]

Since such and such a person (*asuka*) is subject to the law of death (*maraṇadhamma*) and another person is not, there is no assurance (*niyama*) in the law of death for beings (*satta*) and the person who is concentrated in the cessation of perception and cessation can die just like anybody else.

9. For the Arahant there is no premature death (*akālamaccu*).[425]

Having experienced (*paṭisaṃvedayitvā*) the ripening of all his actions (*sabbakammavipāka*), the Arahant is able to become completely extinguished (*parinibbāyitabba*) without the fruit of a previous bad action interrupting his life prematurely.

10. Everything here (*sabbamidaṃ*) is conditioned by action (*kammato*).[426]

The Buddha said: "The world is moved (*vattati*) by action (*kamma*). By action, creatures (*pajā)* are moved. Beings (*satta*) are attached (*nibandhana*) to action like the cotter pin *(āṇi*) of a chariot (*ratha*) wheel in movement (*yāyant*)." He also said: "Laudatory (*pasaṃsa*) fame (*kitti*) is acquired (*labhate*) by action. By action, confiscation (*jāni*), execution (*vadha*), incarceration (*bandha*) [are obtained]. Knowing (*viditvā)* this action of various forms (*nānākaraṇa*), why do people say that the world is not action?" <109>

[424] Ibid., XV, 9. Thesis belonging to the Rājagiriīyas.
[425] Ibid., XVII, 2.
[426] Ibid., XVII, 3.

CHAPTER XII

The Siddhārthikas

They are known only to Buddhaghosa who places them among the four Andhaka sects, and to the list of the Mahāsāṇghika cited by Bhavya who places them among the Mahāsāṇghikas. They may be considered as a late sect of the Mahāsāṇghikas settled around Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.[427]

Their name may be patronymic, Siddhārtha designating either the Buddha or the founder of the sect who is unknown to us. It may also be an adjective, *siddhārthika* meaning 'who has accomplished his task'.

Since Buddhaghosa knew them, the Siddhārthikas existed before the 5th century of our era and since he attributes to them several heresies denounced in the VIIth part of the *Kathāvatthu*, it seems that their appearance should be pushed back in time, perhaps even to the last century before our era.

All the theses attributed to them by Buddhaghosa are also attributed to the Rājagirīyas with whom they seem to have had very close relations.

Here are these theses:

1. There are no things (*dhamma*) that are included (*saṇgahita*) in other things.[428]
2. There are no things (*dhamma*) that are associated (*samapayutta*) with other things.[429]
3. There are no mental (*cetasika*) things (*dhamma*).[430]
4. A gift (*dāna*) is a mental (*cetasika*) thing (*dhamma*).[431]
5. Merit (*puñña*) consisting of rejoicing (*paribhogamaya*) increases (*vaḍḍhati*).[432]
6. As a result of generosity (*dāna*) done here below (*ito*), one is protected (*yāpenti*) up above (*attha*).[433]
7. There is no premature death (*akālamaccu*) for the Arahant.[434]
8. Everything here (*sabbamidaṃ)* is conditioned by actions (*kammato*).[435] <110>

---

[427] Dutt, *Early monastic buddhism*, II, p. 52, notes an inscription mentioned by Burgess (p. 110) which attests to their presence in this area.
[428] Kathāvatthu, VII, 1. For the commentary, refer to the preceding chapter on the Rājagirīyas.
[429] Ibid., VII, 2.
[430] Ibid., VII, 3.
[431] Ibid., VII, 4.
[432] Ibid., VII, 5.
[433] Ibid., VII, 6.
[434] Ibid., XVII, 2.
[435] Ibid., XVII, 3.

CHAPTER XIII

The Sthaviras

We are very poorly informed on the early Sthaviras, these champions of orthodoxy who opposed the first Mahāsāṇghikas. We know that they must not be identified with the Ceylonese Theravādins, despite the archaisms of the latter's doctrine.[436]

Only the tradition of the Sammatīyas cite by Bhavya claims to bring us some information on the doctrine of these early Sthaviras or Pūrva-Sthaviras and attributes to them the following theses:

1. The five propositions of Mahādeva on the nature of the Arhant should be rejected.[437]

This is, indeed, the position according to the other sources adopted by the Sthaviras at the time of the schism provoked by the five propositions of Mahādeva.

2. The person (*pudgala*) exists.[438]

This is the basic thesis of the Vātsīputrīyas and the Sammatīyas. Its attribution to the early Sthavira is just a falsification made by the Sammatīya informant who tries thus to justify the orthodoxy of his own sect.

3. There is an intermediary existence (*antarābhava*).[439]

This also is a pious fraud due to the Sammatīya informant.

4. The complete extinction (*parinirvāṇa*) of the Arhant exists.[440]

5. The past and the future also exist.[441]

This is the fundamental thesis of the Sarvāstivādins who, as we know from elsewhere, the early Sthaviras certainly did not know.

6. The meaning (*artha*) of extinction (nirvāṇa) exists.

This group of facts is thus of no value.[442] <111>

Chapter XIII

[436] Cf. below chap. XXIX.

[437] Bhavya, thesis 1.

[438] Ibid., thesis 2.

[439] Ibid., thesis 3.

[440] Ibid., thesis 4. Nothing original here.

[441] Ibid., thesis 5.

[442] The information regarding the Sthaviras and furnished by Hiuan-tsang, I'tsing and the late Sūtras will be studied in chapter XXIX below.

CHAPTER XIV

The Haimavatas

The origins and the characteristics belonging to this sect present a problem.

The *Śāriputraparipṛcchasūtra*, which undoubtedly is the earliest of our sources concerning the relationship of the sects, is unaware of them.[443] The *Dīpavaṃsa*, slightly more recent, places them beside the Andhakas among the late-appearing sects whose origin is not specified, and not in the chart of affiliation of the immediately preceding sects.[444] A little later, Vasumitra identifies them with the Sthaviras who remained radical after the schism that gave rise to the Sarvāstivādins. Towards the same epoch no doubt, the Sammatiya tradition made them the first sect to split off from the Sthavira group. Both are in agreement in not making any secondary school come from them. Later, the Mahāsāṇghika tradition cited by Bhavya, then Vinītadeva and the *Varṣāgrapṛcchāsūtra* place the Haimavatas among the Mahāsāṇghikas and, more precisely, among the sects called Andhakas by Buddhaghosa. It is even stranger still that Vasumitra himself, while noting that their doctrine is very close to that of the Sarvāstivādins, attributes to them the five theses of Mahādeva which are at the basis of the Mahāsāṇghika doctrine, thus justifying in advance the classification of the Haimavatas in this last group by later authors.

Their name means 'those who dwell in the Himālaya' and attests thus to their geographical origin.

Paramārtha, commenting on Vasumitra who dates the appearance of the Haimavatas at the beginning of the 3rd century E.N., relates that the Sthavira conservatives, reacting against the influence of Kātyāyanīputra who laid too much importance on the teaching of the *Abhidharma*, claimed to return to the teachings of the Sūtras alone, seceded and went to establish themselves in the Himālaya, from which the name of their school which thus perpetuated the orthodox tradition.[445]

K'ouei-ki cites the preceding tradition and says that the schism from which the Haimavatas arose occurred because some Sthaviras criticized the five theses of Mahādeva which up to then all the Sthaviras had accepted like the Mahāsāṇghikas.[446] This is contradicted categorically by all the traditions relative to the first schism who define the Sthaviras precisely as adversaries of Mahādeva.

Przyluski has tried to identify the Haimavatas with the Kāśyapīyas,[447] but, as N. Dutt has rightly commented, this is contradicted by the fact that all our sources distinguish these two sects clearly.[448] <112>

Chapter XIV
[443] T.S. 1465, p. 900bc.
[444] *Dipavaṃsa*, V, 54.
[445] Demiéville: *L'origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 22-23 and 53-54.
[446] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 3a-5b.
[447] *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 317-318.

It seems that the Haimavata were not considered a distinct school before the end of the 4th century of our era and that, at this time, it was noted that some Sthaviras, living in the Himālaya, retained an archaic doctrine, perhaps because of their isolation in the mountains, whence the explanations of Vasumitra and the Sammatīyas. Later it was seen that their doctrine had been strongly influenced by the Mahāsāṇghikas and they were than placed among them. It is even possible that this Mahāsāṇghika influence was exerted and developed later than their rediscovery. Be that as it may, the Haimavatas seem to be indeed one of the schools that, subject to the influence of the two big groups of the Sthaviras and the Mahāsāṇgikas, possessed at one time an eclectic doctrine. It is likewise the case that the Dharmaguptakas, who seem to have had a Canon, if not identical, at least very close to that of the Haimavatas.

No inscription and no evidence of the Chinese travelers tells us anything about their domain, but their name is clear enough to attest that the Haimavatas lived, at least at the beginning, in the Himālaya.

The Chinese translation of a *Vinayamātṛikā* which seems to be a work of the Haimavatas has come down to us.[449] There is the question of the Himālaya, from the need for those dwelling there to be warmly clothed,[450] and of Kāśyapa, the apostle of the Himālaya,[451] which attests at least to the geographic origin of the school to which this work is due.

The latter then gives the descrption of the Canon of the school to which it belonged:

I. *Vinayapiṭaka*	I) Bhikṣuprātimokṣa
	2) Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa
	3) Kaṭhina, etc.
	4) Mātṛkā
	5) Ekottara
II. *Sūtrapiṭaka*	1) Dīrghāgama
	2) Madhyamāgama
	3) Ekottarāgama
	4) Samyuktāgama
	5) Kṣudrakāgama or Saṃyuktapiṭaka
III. *Abhidharmapiṭaka*	1) Sapraśnakavibhaṇga
	2) Apraśnakavibhaṇga
	3) Saṃgraha
	4) Saṃyukta

[448] N. Dutt, *Early monastic Buddhism*, II, p. 170-171.
[449] T.S. 1463. Cf. p. 819ab: "This is the Canon assembled by the five hundred monks in the Himālaya." This phrase sends the story of the council of Rājagṛha and is generally thought to attest to the Haimavata origin of the work.
[450] Ibid., p. 822a.
[451] Ibid., 822a, etc. Cf. Przyluski*: Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 317-318, who gives references concerning the evangelization of the Himālaya by Kāśyapa.

5) Prasthāna[452]

The text specifies the division of the Canon into three Baskets each of five sections.

In another place, the division of the *Sūtrapiṭaka* is given differently: *Ekottarāgama, Madhyamāgama, Dirghāgama, Saṃyuktāgama*; here the order is different and the *Kṣudrakāgama* is missing.[453] We may add that, in the first list <113> given above, the fifth section of the *Sūtrapiṭaka*, which Przyluski gives as *Kṣudrakāgama* because of the similarity with the Pāli Canon, is, rather, *Saṃyuktapiṭaka*. Undoubtedly it is for this reason that the last term is missing in the second list. This reminds us that the Mahāsāṇghikas and the Bahuśrutīyas at some time had a *Saṃyuktapiṭaka* that constituted the fourth canonical Basket.[454]

On the other hand, the plan of the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* resembles that of the Dharmaguptaka *Abhidharmapiṭaka* and the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra* so closely that, at least in the latter, the third and fourth sections form but a single one, *Saṃgrahasāmyukta*.[455]

We know but little of the Haimavata doctrine. Also, the scarce information that we have is weakened by the fact that here Bhavya contradicts both Vasumitra and Vinītadeva and moreover attributes to the Haimavatas, on the word of the Sammatīya tradition, theses that are manifestly Pudgalavādin.

1. The Bodhisattvas are worldly people (*pṛthagjana*).[456]

2. Heretics cannot attain the five superknowledges (*abhijñā*).[457]

Heretics cannot attain the five superknowledges because their teaching (*śāsana*) is wrong (*mithyā)* and they cannot therefore acquire the principles of the superknowledges.[458]

3. Among the Gods (*deva*) there is no pure conduct (*brahmacārya*) or development of the Path (*mārgabhāvana*).[459]

Among the Gods there is no pure conduct because the Goddesses (*devī*), by means of music, arouse in them lustful minds and completely captivate them which causes them to be reborn among humans.[460]

4. The Bodhisattvas enter into the womb without producing any concupiscence (*kāma*).[461]

5. There are Arhants who are won over by another (*paropahṛta*), who have ignorance (*ajñāna*), who have doubts (*kāṇkṣā*), who are instructed by another (*paravitīrna*), and there is the speaking of words (*vacibheda*) when one has entered into the Path (*mārga*).[462]

6. Suffering (*duḥkha*) is abandoned (*prajahāti*) by means of the Path (*mārga*).[463]

---

[452] T.S. 1463, p. 818a.
[453] Ibid., p. 820a.
[454] Cf. above, chap. I and V.
[455] Cf. below, chap. XXVI
[456] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 1, says the opposite. See thesis 45 of the Sarvāstivādins.
[457] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Vinītadeva, thesis 1; Bhavya thesis 2, says the opposite.
[458] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 24b.
[459] Vasumitra, thesis 4;Vinītadeva, thesis 2.
[460] K'ouei-ki, III, p.24b.
[461] Vasumitra, thesis 2. See thesis 21 of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[462] Vasumitra, thesis 5; Bhavya, thesis 4, confirms the fifth proposition,viz. Speaking of words while in meditation. See thesis 30 of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[463] Bhavya, thesis 3.

7. The individual (*pudgala*) must be said (*vaktavya*) to be different from the aggregates (*skandha*) because when he is in nirvāṇa where the aggregates have ceased, the individual persists.[464]

The attribution by the Pudgalavādin Sammatīyas of this Pudgalavādin thesis of the highest degree is very suspicious.

Vasumitra notes that the other Haimavata theses are, for the most part, similar to those of the Sarvāstivādins.

According to Tāranātha, the Haimavatas had disappeared by the time of Dharmapala and Dharmakīrti, i.e., in the 7th century of our era.[465] <114>

[464] Bhavya, thesis 3.
[465] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 175.

CHAPTER XV

The Vātsīputrīyas

According to the agreement of all the sources, the sect of the Vātsīputrīyas is perhaps the first off-shoot of the Sthavira trunk after that of the Himavata. The schism that gave rise to it occurred just 200 years after the Nirvāṇa, about 280 C.E. according to the Sammatiya tradition which must rest on the Vātsīputrīya tradition itself, or at the beginning of the 3rd century somewhat after 280 C.E. according to the traditions of the north-west. One would not go too far wrong in placing this event under the reign of Maurya Bindusāra (289-264 C.E.).

The Vātsīputrīyas take their name from the founder of their sect, Vātsīputra.[466] According to the *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra*, the latter was a master of discipline (*vinayadhāra*).[467] According to K'ouei-ki, he was of the Brahman caste.[468] Paramārtha makes him a disciple of Śāriputra.[469]

The Ceylonese tradition calls then Vajjiputtakas and not, as we might expect, Vacchīputtaka. The difference may be easily explained phonetically, but it should be noted because the name Vajjiputtaka also designates the Vṛjjiputrakas, i.e., the monks of Vaiśalī of the Vṛjji clan who, by their breaches of the monastic code, provoked the convocation of the Council of Vaiśalī, 100 or 110 years after the Nirvāṇa. From this, it might be concluded that the Vātsīputrīyas were none other that these Vṛjjiputtakas if, on the one hand, the Ceylonese tradition identified them, which is not the case, and if all the other traditions did not clearly distinguish the two names. There is, therefore no link between them. [470]

Lin Li-Kouang, relying on the suspicious evidence of the Chinese monk Seng-yeou (beginning of the 6th century of our era), has elaborated an ingenious hypothesis in which he affirms that the Vātsīputrīyas are none other than the "reformed Mahāsāṇghikas".[471] The fragility of this hypothesis, seductive though it may be, is too great for it to be taken into account. At the beginning of the chapter dedicated to the Mahāsāṇghikas, we have seen what must be thought of this 'reform' that arose among the latter. Lin Li-Kouang, very loyally, does not conceal the fact that the identification of the Mahāsāṇghika Vinaya with that of the Vātsīputrīya does not exist in the post-scriptum of the former on which it is based. It is, therefore, an invention of Seng-yeou. On the other hand - and this is decisive - the *agreement of all the sources*, Indian or directly inspired by Indian accounts, absolutely distinguish the Vātsīputrīyas from the

[466] S. J. Thomas, in his *History of Buddhist Thought*, pp. 38-39, notes, suggests another explanation: the Vātsīputrīyas were the monks from the land of the Vatsas, capital Kauśāmbī.
[467] T. S. 468, p. 501b.
[468] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 5b.
[469] Ibid., II, 6a.
[470] Dutt: *Early Monastic Buddhism*, II, p. 174, accepts, however, the hypothesis of this identification.
[471] Lin Li Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, pp. 194, 202 n. 2, 297-302.

Mahāsāṇghikas.[472] Seng-yeou, on whom clearly the accusation of 'skullduggery of texts' weighs, would not be capable of opposing this agreement.

The Vātsīputrīyas themselves have left no trace of their residence in India or elsewhere. This certainly shows that they were soon eclipsed by one of their sub-sects, the Sammitīyas, whose extraordinary development in India in the 7th century of our era has been noted by Hiuan-tsang. Nothing of their literature is known except that, on the evidence of the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*[473] and of Paramārtha, their *Abhidharmapiṭaka* was called *Śāriputrābhidharma* or *Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharma*, and consisted of nine parts. Unfortunately it has not come down to us.

According to Tāranātha, the Vātsīputrīyas still existed as a distinct sect at the time of the Pāla kings (10-11th century of our era).[474]

Here are the theses attributed to them:

1. The individual (*pudgala*) is perceived as an evident reality (*sākṣītkṛtaparamārthena*). The individual is neither identical (*sama*) with the aggregates (*skandha*) nor different (*viṣama*) from them. It exists neither within the aggregates nor outside them.[475]

It is the personalist thesis (*pudgalavādin*) that distinguishes them from all other Buddhists and brings them closer to the Brahmans, Hindus and Jains.

Here are some of the many arguments by means of which the Vātsīputrīyas defend their thesis. It has been said by the Bhagavant: "Having transmigrated (*sandhāvitvāna*) seven times or more (*sattakkhattuparamaṃ),* the individual (*pudgala*) puts an end to suffering (*dukkhassantakaro hoti*) and becomes one who has exhausted all the fetters (*sabbasaññojanakkhaya*)", thus, there exists an individual that transmigrates (*sandhāvati*) from this world (*asmā lokā)* to another world (*paraṃ lokaṃ)* and from another world to this world. It has been said by the Bhagavant: "O monks, I see (*passamāhaṃ*) by means of the perfectly pure (*visuddha*) and superhuman (*atikkantamānusaka*) divine eye (*dibba cakkhu*) the beings (*satta*) who pass (*cavamāna*), who are reborn (*upapajjamāna*), lowly (*hīna*) or excellent (*paṇita*), handsome (*suvaṇṇa*) or ugly (*dubbaṇṇa*), having good destinies (*sugata*) or bad destinies (*duggata*), I know (*pajānāmi*) the beings who are rewarded according to their actions (*yathākammūpaga*)." It has been said by the Bhagavant: "O monks, I will explain to you the burden (*bhāra*), the bearer of the burden (*bhāradhāra*), the taking up of the burden (*bhāradāna*), the setting down of the burden (*bhāranikkhepana*)." It has been said by the Bhagavant: "An individual, O monks, who is born into the world (*lok*a) is born (*uppajjati*) for the benefit of many people (*bahujanahitāya*)." An individual entered into the stream (*sotāpanna*), deceases in the world of men (*manussaloka*) and is reborn in the world of the gods (*devaloka*), stays there entered into the stream. There is someone who sees (*passati*), who hears (*suṇāti*), who feels (*ghāyati*), who tastes

---

[472] A. Bareau: *Une confusion entre Mahāsāṇghika et Vātsīputrīya*, J.A., 1953, pp. 399-406.

[473] Lamotte: *Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, I, p. 112. Demiéville, *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 23 and 57. This is not the T 1548, despite the similarity of titles.

[474] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 274.

[475] *Kathāvatthu*, I, 1*; Satyasiddhi*, T 1646, p. 259a; *Vibhāṣā,* T 1545, pp. 55a and 8b; Vasumitra, thesis I; Bhavya, thesis 5; Vinitadeva, thesis 1; L,V.P. IX, p. 232.

(*sāyati*), who touches (*phusati*), who knows (*vijñanāti*), something that is seen, heard, etc…. In the same way, there is someone (*koci*) who is endowed with the superknowledges (*abhiññā),* who hears sound by means of the divine (*dibba*) ear (*sotadhātu*), who knows (*jānāti*) the mind of another (*paracitta*), etc…. The existence of consciousness assumes the existence of the subject of the consciousness, which is the individual. Since there are <116> mothers (*mātā),* fathers (*pitā),* noblemen (*khattiya*), brāhmans, gods (*deva*), men (*manussa*), etc. …, there are individuals who bear these names. An analogous argument is based on the recognized existence of the various kinds of Buddhist saints.

2. That which is graspable (*upādānīya*) and provided with grasping (*upādāna*) by the passions and the defilements, i.e., what is based on the aggregates (*skandha*), spheres *(āyatana*) and the elements (*dhātu*) is merely denomination (*prajñapti*).[476]

This thesis is a corollary of the preceding. That with which ignorant people identify the individual, i.e., such and such an aggregate, sphere, element that is subject to the passions, is just a fiction, pure denomination, and cannot therefore be the individual himself.[477]

3. Except for the individual (*pudgala*), no thing (*dharma*) transmigrates (*saṃkrāmati*) from this world (*asmāllokāt*) to another world (*paraṃ lokaṃ*).[478]

If no thing transmigrates, it may be said that, when the vital faculty (*jīvitendriya*) has ceased (*niruddha*), all things have ceased likewise. But as the individual (*pudgala*) has not ceased, it can transmigrate from one world to the other and, as things are not different from the individual, it can be said that there is transmigration (*saṃkrānti*).[479]

4. All conditioned factors (*saṃskṛta*) last only for a single moment (*ekakṣānika*).[480]

According to Bhavya, the Vātsīputrīyas maintained that the conditioned factors are instantaneous or not. Lacking any commentary, it is hard to understand this last proposition.

5. The five sensory consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) are neither provided with passions (*sarāga*) nor without passions (*virāga*).[481]

The five consciousnesses are neither provided with nor without passions for they are merely indeterminate (*avyākṛta*), i.e., neither good (*kuśala*) nor bad (*akuśala*).

6. There are also heretics (*tīrthika*) who possess the five superknowledges (*abhijñā*).[482]

The heretics are able to obtain the superknowledges by means of seeing (*darśana*) and meditation (*bhāvanā*).

7. The abandoning (*prahāna*) of the fetters (*saṃyojana*) of the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) that are to be abandoned by meditation (*bhāvanayā prahātavya*) is what is called detachment (*virāga*). This is not the abandoning of the fetters that are to be abandoned by seeing (*darśanena prahātavya*).[483]

---

476 Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 1.
477 Kouei-ki, p. 26b.
478 Vasumitra, thesis 3; Bhavya, theses 2 and 3.
479 K'ouei-ki, III, p. 27a
480 Vasumitra, thesis 2; Bhavya, thesis 3.
481 Vasumitra, thesis 5; Bhavya, thesis 8; Viniītadeva, thesis 3.
482 Vasumitra, thesis 4.

The fetters of the desire realm that are to be abandoned by meditation are ignorance (*moha*), hatred (*dveṣa*) and lust (*rāga*). Ignorance is just delusion (*māyā).* It is not an obstacle *(āvaraṇa*) to the factors [of enlightenment, such as emptiness (*śūnya*), selflessness (*anātmya*, etc…. The six meditation practices on the impurities *(āsrava*) cannot make these factors evident (*sākṣītkaroti*), they can only control ignorance. Ignorance is therefore not something that must be abandoned by seeing. <117> As soon as these factors have been seen, the fetters can definitively be abandoned. Worldlings (*pṛthagjana*) and saints *(ārya*) abandon the fetters of *kāmadhātu*, etc…, by means of the six practices.[484]

8. Patience (*kṣānti*), names (*nāman*), aspects *(ākara*) and the supreme worldly things (*laukikāgradharma*) are called "those that make one enter into correction (*samyaktva*) [French: *correction*; perfection ?] and leave rebirths (*upapatti*).[485]

The stage of patience is that in which, at the beginning of clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the four truths (*satya*), the latter are examined only together. The stage of name is that in which one can examine the points (*dharma*) of the teaching (*śāsana*). The stage of aspects is the one in which, following the clear comprehension of the Truths, one examines the essence of their principles. In the stage of supreme worldly things, which follows the stage of appearance uninterruptedly, one attains the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*). The Vātīputrīyas maintain that these four things alone are called roots of good (*kuśalamūla*).[486]

9. In the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*), there are twelve mind moments (*cittakṣana*) where one is said to be 'oriented' (*pratipanna*). On the thirteenth path moment, one is called Fruit of abiding (*sthitiphala*).[487]

Three minds are dedicated to each Truth (*satya*). [Thus, in regard to the Truth of suffering (*duḥkhasatya*):] i) Knowledge of painful things (*duḥkhadharmajñāna*) by means of which one examines the suffering of the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*). ii) Patience in regard to painful things (*duḥkhadharmakṣānti*): after having examined the Truth of suffering of *kāmadhātu*, one abandons (*prajahāti*) the ignorance that has not yet been abandoned (*aprahīna*) [in *kāmadhātu*) for there still is ignorance in the higher realms (*dhātu*)], by means of repeated examination. iii) Knowledge of the types of suffering (*duḥkhānvayajñāna*): by examining altogether the suffering of the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and formless realm (*arūpadhātu*), one exhausts the Truth of suffering in all three realms. The third mind is either a mind related (*santati*) to the knowledge of the type of Path (*mārgānvayajñāna*) or a mind of clear comprehension of the four Truths together. After having passed through [the first twelve minds] successively, one obtains the fruit (*phala*), then, in the same way, successively, the twelfth and thirteenth fruits.[488]

10. The knowable (*jñeya*) is expressible (*abhilāpya*) and inexpressible (*anabhilāpya*).[489]

---

[483] Vasumitra, thesis 6.
[484] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 28a. Cf. L.V.P., *Kośa,* V, pp. 13-14.
[485] Vasumitra, thesis 7.
[486] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 48b, and Oyama, III, p. 48b. Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, VI, pp. 165-169.
[487] Vasumitra, thesis 7; Vinītadeva, thesis 4.
[488] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 49 ab L.V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, pp. 179-185.
[489] Vinītadeva, thesis 5. Lacking any commentary, the meaning of this proposition remains enigmatic.

11. One should not say that Extinction (*nirvāṇa*) is truly identical with all things, nor that it is truly different.[490] This is a corollary of thesis 1 above. If the individual (*pudgala*) is neither identical nor different from things, his extinction is necessarily neither identical nor different from them.

12. One should not say that Extinction (*nirvāṇa*) really exists or does not really exist.[491]
This is a corollary of the preceding thesis. <118>

13. The Arhat falls (*parihāyati*) from sainthood (*arahattva*).[492]

It was said by the Blessed One: "O monks, five things (*dhamma*) lead to (*saṃvattanti*) the falling (*parihāna*) of the monk liberated conditionally (*samayavimutta*). – What are these five? The fact of taking pleasure in action (*kammārāmatā),* the fact of taking pleasure in talking (*bhassārāmatā),* the fact of taking pleasure in sleeping (*niddārāmatā),* the fact of taking pleasure in society (*saṇghaṇikārāmatā).* As the liberated (*vimutta*) mind (*citta*) does not observe (*paccavekkhati*) them, in truth, O monks, these five things lead to the fall of the conditionally liberated monk."

14. The supreme worldly things (*laukikāgradharma*) are the five faculties of faith (*śraddhendriya*), exertion (*vīryendriya*), memory (*smṛtīndriya*), contemplation (*samādhīndriya*) and wisdom (*prajñendriya*), due to their self nature (*svabhāva*).[493]
Alone, these five faculties are good (*kuśala*) by their self nature. It is because they are mixed with them that the others may also be said to be good. It is because they are based on these five faculties that the saints *(ārya*) are distinguished from other people and not because they are based on the other faculties. As the Sūtra says: "There are five faculties that increase resolution. Because they are cultivated and because they are practiced equally and fully, one completely realizes deliverance (*vimukti*)."[494]

15. The individual (*pudgala*) cognizes (*jānāti*) things (*dharma*).[495]

16. Knowledge (*jñāna*) is only a member of the Path (*mārgānga*) and consciousness (*vijñāna*) is only a member of existence (*bhavāṇga*).[496]
The Sūtra says indeed that right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*) is a member of the Path whereas consciousness has the formations (*saṃskāra*) as object. [497]

17. One single eye (*cakṣus*) sees (*paśyati*) forms (*rūpa*).[498]

18. It is only in regard to the individual (*pudgala*) that the tendencies (*anuśaya*) have the meaning (*artha*) of increase (*anuśayana*).[499]
It is the individual, not the mind (*citta*), etc., that is at the same time with and without tendencies, for he is fettered or unfettered.[500]

---

[490] Bhavya, thesis 6.
[491] Bhavya, thesis 7.
[492] *Kathāvatthu*, I, 2.
[493] *Vibhāṣā*, T 1545, p. 8b.
[494] *Vibhāṣā,* T 1545, p. 8b.
[495] *Ibid*, p. 42c. No line of argument is mentioned.
[496] *Ibid*, p. 44b.
[497] *Ibid*, p. 44b.
[498] *Ibid*., p. 62a. No line of argument is mentioned.
[499] *Ibid*., p. 110b.

19. Extinction (*nirvāṇa*) is both *śaikṣa, aśaikṣa* and neither *śaikṣa* nor *aśaikṣa*.[501]

20. The ten latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) that are to be abandoned by seeing (*darśanena prahātavya*) in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) constitute the nature (*bhāva*) of the worldling (*pṛthagjana*).[502] The nature of the worldling is included in the desire realm. This defiled nature (*kliṣṭabhāva*) is to be abandoned by seeing. It consists (*saṃgrahita*) of the aggregate of the psychic formations (*saṃskāraskandha*) associated (*saṃprayukta*) with mind (*citta*).[503]

21. The fetters (*saṃyojana*), that which is liable to be fettered (*saṃyojanīya*) and the individual (*pudgala*) are real.[504]

22. Sound (*śabda*) is fruit of retribution (*vipākaphala*).[505] <119>

It is said in the Sūtras that the Bodhisattva, having abandoned coarse bad speech during his previous existences, obtained heavenly sound as a result of accomplishing this action. This is why it is said that sound is the fruit of ripening.

23. All beings (*sattva*) have two kinds of loss *(āpatti* ?): the loss of the mind (*manas*) and the loss of the object (*vastu*).[506]

24. Birth (*jāti*) and death (*maraṇa*) have two kinds of dominating causes (*adhipatihetu*): the *kleśas* and actions (*karman*).[507]

25. Two kinds of things (*dharma*) are dominating cause (*adhipatihetu*) for deliverance (*vimukti*): examination (*vipaśyanā)* and quiescence (*śamatha*).[508]

26. If it is not supported *(āśraya*) by the self nature (*svabhāva*) and does not take shame as dominating condition (*adhipatipratyaya*), the Holy Dharma does not go with a person.[509]

27. The roots (*mūla*) of the *kleśas* are of two kinds: perpetually they are in operation in accordance with all the beings, and [secondly], in ignorance (*avidyā)* there is craving (*tṛṣṇā).*[510]

28. There are seven kinds of bases of purity (*viśuddhisthāna*).[511]

29. The objects of the knowledge of the Buddhas (*buddhajñāna*) are dissociated (*viprayukta*) from the virtues (*śīla*), etc.[512]

30. By taking their support *(āśraya*) on right understanding that has everything (*sarva*) as object *(ālambana*), the Buddhas are able to penetrate all things (*dharma*).[513]

---

[500] *Ibid*., p. 110b.
[501] *Ibid.,* pp. 169a and 8b. No line of argument is given.
[502] *Ibid*., pp. 231b and 8b; on 8b, it is said that the tendencies are disconnected (*viprayukta*).
[503] *Ibid*., pp. 231b and 8b.
[504] *Ibid*., pp. 288b and 8b: no argumet given.
[505] *Ibid*., p. 612c.
[506] Vasumitra, supplementary series to the version of Paramārtha, thesis 1. In the absence of commentary, this thesis remains enigmatic.
[507] *Ibid*., thesis 2. Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 307-308.
[508] *Ibid*, thesis 3. Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 280 and VII, p. 21.
[509] *Ibid*., thesis 4. Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 172.
[510] *Ibid*, thesis 5. See Bhavya, thesis of the Dhamottariyas.
[511] *Ibid*., thesis 6.
[512] *Ibid*., thesis 7.
[513] *Ibid*, thesis 8.

31. There are six kinds of shared things that are included in cessation (*nirodha*).[514]

32. In the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*), there is no entrance into perfection (*samyaktva*).[515]

33. When the Bodhisattvas are reborn into an intermediate existence (*antarābhava*), if they formerly have given rise to the knowledge of exhaustion (*kṣayajñāna*) and the knowledge of non-production (*anutpādajñāna*), they can attain the title of Buddha.[516]

The Vātsīputrīyas, like the Sammatīyas, therefore accepted the intermediary existence. They also accepted that a Bodhisattva could become Buddha in the intermediary existence.

34. The Sūtras spoken by the Tathāgata have three meanings: 1) the revelation of wrongdoings *(āpatti*) [that lead to] birth (*jāti*) and death (*maraṇa*); 2) the revelation of merits (*puṇya*) [that lead to] deliverance (*vimukti*); 3) the non-revealable.[517]

The Buddha's teaching therefore has partially an esoteric meaning.

35. The supreme worldly things (*laukikāgradharma*) are included (*paryāpanna*) in the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*).[518] <120>

Actually, if on a given ground (*bhūmi*) there is the Noble path *(āryamārga*), these supreme worldly things are on that ground.

36. There are six destinies (gati), including that of the Asuras.[519]

37. The latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are formations dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayuktasaṃskāra*).[520]

38. There is only one unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*), namely, Extinction (*nirodha*).[521]

39. The nature of the worldling (*pṛthagjanabhāva*), bad (*akuśala*) bodily action (*kāyakarman*) and vocal action (*vākkarman*) are to be abandoned by seeing (*darśana prahātavya*).[522]

The nature of the worldling is an undefiled (*akliṣṭa*) and indeterminate (*avyākṛta*) dharma. Bad bodily or vocal action, ripening as a bad destiny (*durgati*) is form (*rūpa*). But the quality of worldling and the action that cause a bad destiny are contradictory to the path of seeing (*darśanamārga*). They must therefore be abandoned by seeing.

40. Information by way of the body (*kāyavijñapti*) is movement (*gati*), for it occurs when there is movement, not when there is no movement.[523] <121>

---

514 *Ibid*., thesis 9. The translation is uncertain.
515 *Ibid*., thesis 10.
516 *Ibid*., thesis 11.
517 *Ibid*, thesis 12.
518 *Vibhāṣā,* T 1545, p. 14a; T 1546, p. 9b.
519 *Ibid*., T 1545, p. 8b; T 1546, p. 6a.
520 *Ibid*., T 1545, p. 8b.
521 L.V.P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 7, n. 2.
522 *Ibid*., I, p. 79.
523 *Ibid*., IV, p. 4.

CHAPTER XVI

The Sammatīyas

All the early sources agree in considering the Sammitīyas as one of the four sects coming from the Vātsīputrīyas, either the third (sources of the north-west) or the fourth (Ceylonese sources). According to the former, their appearance dates from the middle of the 3rd century E.N., or the middle of the 2nd century C.E. In reality, no definite trace of their existence is found before the 2nd century of our era. If, as Paramārtha has it, the schism that gave rise to them was provoked by a discussion about the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Vātsīputrīyas, it is necessary to date their appearance from the 1st century before or after our era.

According to the orthographies and the translations, their name may mean: those who live in harmony, those who should be respected (Pāli, *saṃmitīya*), those who have assembled, equal (Pāli, *samitīya*), those who have a right rule, or the equal ones (*saṃmitīya*). According to Bhavya (1st list), their name comes from their teacher Saṃmata. K'ouei-ki explains that, as the meaning (*artha*) of the very profound (*sugambhīra*) Law (*dharma*) that they uphold is correct, without error, highly respected, correctly considered, they were given this name.[524]

Only two inscriptions attest to their presence, the one at Mathurā from the 2nd century of our era,[525] the other at Sārnāth in the 4th century, where they had replaced the Sarvāstivādins who themselves had previously evicted the Sthaviras.[526] As early as the beginning of the 7th century, their importance had become considerable to the point that that Hiuan-tsang, I-tsing and Vinītadeva considered them to be the preeminent school of the Vātsīptrīyas, grouping all the sects of this branch under their name. In the second quarter of the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang encountered more or less important groups of them in the entire middle Ganges valley where they totaled some 12,000 monks living in about 80 monasteries, more than 5,000 in about fifteen monasteries in the lower Ganges, 20,000 in hundreds of monasteries in Mālava, 6,000 in a hundred monasteries at Valabhḥī, 20,000 in hundreds of monasteries in the Indus delta.[527] According to Hiuan-tsang, it was the most numerous group with more than 60,000 monks out of a total of 220,00. In the last years of the 7th century, I-tsing noticed them especially in western India, at Magadha in eastern India, and in small numbers in the south, but not in Ceylon or in the north. Still according to I-tsing, a few were encountered in the Sonde islands and an important group at Champa where they predominated.[528] According to Bhavya (1st list) and Vinītadeva, they[529] were divided at this time into two

[524] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 6b.
[525] H. Sastri: *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XIX (Calcutta, 1927-8), p. 67.
[526] Hultzsch: Epigraphia Indica, vol. VIII (Calcutta, 1905-6), p. 172.
[527] See detail above, 1st Part, chap. III.
[528] Takausu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, pp. xxiv, 8 seq.

schools, <122> the Avantakas and the Kurukulas. These two names can be explained geographically: the Avantakas perhaps being the Sammatīyas from Avanta or Avanti, i.e., the region situated north of the Narbada and east of the lower Indus; the Kurukulas, 'those of the Kuru family', may have been the Sammitīyas residing in the territory of the early Kurukṣetra, i.e., on the upper Ganges around Sthāneśvara. The sister of the well-known king Harṣa Śīlāditya, who was clearly from the lineage of the princes of Sthāneśvara, is said to have revered the sect of the Sammatīyas especially,[530] and on the other hand, Hiuan-tsang found numerous monks of this sect in the region at the same time period.

According to I-tsing, their *Tripiṭaka* contained only 200,000 *ślokas,* 30,000 of which were of the *Vinayapiṭaka* alone.[531] The bottom of their monastic robe was cut in an irregular shape, they slept in kinds of enclosures marked off by ropes and serving as shared dormitories.[532] They draped their under-robe in the way of Indian women, throwing the right end over the left end allowing the sections to float freely.[533]

According to certain late Tibetan works, they had as patron saint the śudra Upāli, the famous scholar who recited the *Vinayapiṭaka* at the Council of Rājagṛha. Their language was Paiśācī or rather Apabhraṃśa. Their robe consisted of twenty to twenty-five strips of cloth or of ten to fifteen strips. Their symbol was an areca flower. Their names ended preferentially with *–dāsa* and *–sena*, but sometimes also with *-śīla*, *-hari*, *-candra* and *–guhya*. [534]

Of their literature, there remains for us only the Chinese translation of the *Sammatīyanikāyaśāstra*, a rather short work, obviously post-canonical, which gives us some precious information on the Sammatīya doctrine,[535] and a short treatise on the Vinaya.[536]

According to Paramārtha, the Sammatīyas formed one of the four schools coming out of the Vātsīputrīyas who, dissatisfied with the *Abhidharma* of Śāriputra, the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Vātsīputrīyas, composed treatises (*śāstra*) to complement the meaning of the Sūtras. They "… explained the *Abhidharma* of Śāriputra, completing the meaning in the places where it is insufficient by means of the meaning of the Sūtras."[537]

Vasumitra tells that the schism was due to differing explanations given by the four sects of the following stanza (*gāthā*):

> Being already liberated, one falls again.
> The fall comes from passion; one returns again.

---

[529] The names of these two schools are not certain for they correspond poorly to the translations, Tibetan rather than Chinese, given by the *Mahāvyutpatti*.
[530] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, p. 346. Hiuan-tsang, on the contrary, elsewhere says that she was an ardent Mahāyanist: Grousset: *Sur les traces du Bouddha*, p. 196.
[531] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, pp. xxiv and 8.
[532] Ibid., p. 7.
[533] Ibid., pp. 66-67.
[534] Lin-Li Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, pp. 1676-181 and 205-208.
[535] T 1649, transl. between 350 and 431.
[536] T 1641.
[537] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 58.

Having obtained the place of peaceful joy, this is happiness.

If one pursues the practices of happiness, this is perfect happiness."

Commenting on this passage by Vasumitra, K'ouei-ki explains that, according to the Sammatīyas, six kinds of individuals correspond to the four fruits (*phala*): 1) the liberated one (*vimukta*), i.e., the 'One who has entered the stream' (*srotāpanna*) who has attained liberation (*vimukti*); 2) the one who goes from family to family (*kulaṃkula*), i.e., the one who is directed towards the second fruit; 3) the one who has obtained the fruit of a single rebirth (*sakṛdāgamain*); 4) the one who has only one interval <123> (*ekavīcika*); 5) the one who will not return here any more (*anāgamin*); 6) the Arhant. The first line (*pāda*) designates the liberated one who can fall back into error. The second line designates the one who goes from family to family, the fourth individual, who can fall out of desire (*kāma*), and the third individual, who will return to this world. The third line designates the fifth individual [who will not return to this world], and the fourth line designates the Arhant.[538]

The tradition of the Sammatīyas cited by Bhavya attributes to them only one thesis which is given as fundamental.

1. What should exist (*bhavanīya*) and what does exist (*bhava*), what should cease (*nirodhavya*) and what has ceased (*niruddha*), what should arise (*janitavya*) and what has arisen (*jāta*), what should die (*maraṇīya*) and what is dead (*mṛta*), what should be done (*kṛtya*) and what is done (*kṛta*), what should be liberated (*moktavya*) and what is liberated (*mokta*), what should go (*gantavya*) and what has gone (*gāmin*), what should be understood (*vijñeya*), and consciousness (*vijñāna*) exist.

Lacking any commentary, the exact meaning of this thesis escapes us. However, it seems to treat the ontological problem.

Vinītadeva alone and especially the *Kathāvatthu* inform us in some detail on their doctrines. Here are their theses:

1. The person (*pudgala*) is perceived (*upalabbhati*) as an evident reality (*sacchikaṭṭhaparamaṭṭhena*). The person (*pudgala*) is not truly identical with the aggregates (s*kandha*). He is not in the aggregates neither does he exist outside of the aggregates.[539]

2. The Arhat falls (*parihāyati*) from sainthood (*arahattā).*[540]

3. There is no pure conduct (*brahmacariyavāsa*) among the Gods (*deva*).[541]

Among the Gods there are no itinerant monks (*pabbajja*), shaven-headed (*muṇḍiya*), wearing the monastic robe (*kāsāvadhāra*) and carrying the begging bowl (*pattadhāra*). Sammāsaṃbuddhas, Paccekabuddhas, the pairs of disciples (*sāvakayuga*) are not born among the Gods. Consequently, there can be no cultivation of the Path (*maggabhāvanā)* or pure conduct.

4. The afflictions (*kilesa*) are abandoned (*jahati*) one after another (*odhisodhiso*).[542]

---

[538] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 30 ab. L.V.P., *Kośa*, VI, pp. 195-230.
[539] *Kathāvatthu*, I, 1; Vinītadeva, thesis 1. T 1649, pp. 462a-469b. See thesis 1 of the Vātsīputrīyas.
[540] Kathāvatthu, I, 2. See thesis 13 of the Vātsīputrīyas.
[541] *Ibid*., I, 3.

The 'stream-enterers' (*sotāpanna*) and other noble individuals desire (*icchanti*) the abandoning of the afflictions (*kilesappahāna*) portion by portion (*ekadesena ekadesena*), one after the other (*odhiso odhiso*) by seeing suffering (*dukkhadassana*) and the other Truths, by means of different clear understandings (*nānābhisamayavasena*). Besides, the Buddha said: "Progressively (*anupubbena*), little by little (*thokaṃ thokaṃ)* from one moment to the next (*khāṇe khāṇe*), the intelligent man (*medhavī*) cleanses (*niddhame*) his own stains (*malamattano*) like a goldsmith washes away the stains of money (*rajata*)."

5. The worldly man (*puthujjana*) abandons (*jahati*) the passion of desire (*kāmarāga*) and ill-will (*byāpāda*).[543]

It was said by the Blessed One: "In the past (*atītaṃsa*) there were (*ahesuṃ)* six famous (*yassassī*) teachers (*satthā),* spreading the perfume of virtue (*nirāmagandha*), full of compassion (*karuṇā),* free (*vimutta*) <124> of the fetter of desire (*kāmasaññojana*). Being detached from the passion of desire (*kāmarāga*), they attained the Brahma realm (*brahmalokūpaga*). They had many (*aneka*) hundreds (*satsa*) of listeners (*sāvaka*) spreading a perfume of virtue, full of compassion, free of the fetter of desire. Being detached from the passion of desire, the latter have attained the realm of Brahma." The worldly man who has obtained knowledge (*ñāṇalābhī*), who has the clear understanding of the Truths (*saha saccābhisamaya*), who is a Non-returner (*anāgamin*), has abandoned (*pahīna*) desire and ill-will.

6. Clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) is progressive (*anupubbha*).[544]

7. In the seventh (*aṭṭhamaka*) individual (*puggala*), the manifestly active affliction of heresy (*diṭṭhipariyuṭṭhāna*) and the manifestly active affliction of doubt (*vicikicchāpariyuṭṭhāna*) are abandoned (*pahīna*).[545]

In the candidate for the fruit of 'Stream-enterer' (*sotāpattiphala*), two manifestly active afflictions (*pariyuṭṭhāna*), those of heresy (*diṭṭhi*) and doubt (*vicikicchā),* are abandoned because of the non-existence of their practice (*samudācārābhāvato*).

8. The divine eye (*dibbacakkhu*) is the fleshly eye (*maṃsacakkhu*) based on things (*dhammūpatthaddha*).[546]

The divine eye is just the fleshly eye based on the things of the fourth meditation (*catutthajjhāna*). No proof of this thesis is noted.

9. Merit (*puñña*) consisting of joy (*paribhogamaya*) increases (*vaḍḍhati*).[547]

The Buddha said: "For those who give (*dadanti*) something to drink (*papa*), a well (*udapāna*) or refuge (*upassaya*), merit increases (*pavaḍḍhati*) by day (*divā),* by night (*ratta*), always *(sadā*)." In another *Sutta*, the Buddha said: "For the one thanks to whom a monk (*bhikkhu*) rejoices (*paribhuñjamāna*) when he has been given a robe (*cīvara*), alms food (*piṇdapāta*), etc.,…, there is the result of merit (*punābhisanda*), a good result (*kusalābhisanda*), the nourishment of happiness (*sukkhassāhāra*), happy ripening

---

[542] *Ibid*., I, 4.
[543] *Ibid*., I, 5.
[544] *Ibid*., II, 7. See thesis 4 of the Andhakas.
[545] *Ibid*., III, 5.
[546] *Ibid*., III, 7.
[547] *Ibid*., VII, 5.

(*sukhavipāka*), celestial (*sovaggika*), leading to Heaven (*saggasaṃvattanika*)…" These gifts consisting of joy are gifts of moral obligation (*deyyadhamma*).

10. There is an intermediate existence (*antarābhava*).[548]

11. There is an individual (*attabhāva*) provided with six sensory realms (*saḷāyatanika*) in the form realm (*rūpadhātu*).[549]

12. The physical action (*kāyakamma*) having its origin (*samuṭṭhita*) in a good (*kusala*) mind (*citta*) is good form (*rūpa*). Form is action.[550]

Physical action and vocal action (*vacīkamma*) are form (*rūpa*) considered as information (*viññatti*) by the body (*kāya*) or by the voice (*vacī*). If its origin is good (*kusalasamuṭṭhāna*), it is good and if its origin is bad (*akusalasamuṭṭhāna*), it is bad (*akusala*).

13. There is no material (*rūpa*) vital faculty (*jīvitindriya*).[551]

14. The Arahant falls (*parihāyati*) from sainthood (*arahattā)* because of his actions (*kammahetu*).[552] <125>

15. The form (*rūpa*) of the one who is provided with the Path (*maggasamaṇgī*) is Path (*magga*).[553]

Right speech (*sammāvācā),* right behavior (*sammākammanta*), right livelihood (*sammājīva*) are form and nevertheless are part of the Path.

16. Information (*viññatti*) is virtue (*sīla*).[554]

Information by way of the body (*kāyaviññati*) is physical action (*kāyakamma*), information by way of the voice (*vacīviññat*i) is vocal action (*vacīkamma*). But virtue is physical and vocal action. Therefore information by way of the body and information by way of the voice are virtue. Moreover, it cannot be said truly (*na hevaṃ vattabbe*) that information is immoral (*dussīlya*).

17. The tendencies (*anusaya*) are indeterminate (*abyākata*), non-caused (*ahetuka*) and dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*).[555]

The worldly man (*puthujjana*) must be said to be provided with tendencies (*sānusaya*) when his mind (*citta*) stays (*vattamāna*) good (*kusala*) or indeterminate (*abhyākata*), But it cannot truly be said (*na hevaṃ vattabbe*) that good and bad (*kusalākusala*) things (*dhamma*) come *(āgacchanti*) into conflict (*sammukhībhāva*) in him. In the same way, as it cannot be said that they are caused (*sahetuka*) by a cause (*hetu*), the tendencies are non-caused. Finally, since it cannot be said that they are associated (*saṃpayutta*) with the mind (*citta*), the tendencies are dissociated from the mind.

18. The passion for matter (*rūparāga*) that rests (*anuseti*) on the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) is included in the form realm (*rūpadhātupariyāpanna*). The passion for the non-material (*arūparāga*) that rests on the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*) is included in the formless realm (*arūpadhātupariyāpanna*).[556]

---

[548] *Ibid*., VIII, 2. See thesis 11 of the Pūrvaśailas. T 1649, pp. 469b-471c.
[549] *Ibid*., VIII, 7. See thesis 36 of the Andhakas.
[550] *Ibid*., VIII, 9.
[551] *Ibid*., VIII, 10.
[552] *Ibid*., VIII, 11. See thesis 15 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[553] *Ibid*., X, 1.
[554] *Ibid*., X, 9.
[555] *Ibid*., XI, 1.

Since the passion of desire (*kāmarāga*) that rests on the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) is included in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*), the passion for form that rests on the form realm is included in the form realm, and the passion for the non-material that rests on the formless realm is included in the formless realm.

19. Action (*kamma*) is other (*aññā*) than the accumulation of action (*kammūpacaya*).[557]

What is called accumulation of action is different from action dissociated from mind (*cittavippayutta*), indeterminate (*abhākata*) and without object (*anārammaṇa*).

20. Form (*rūpa*) is good (*kusala*) or bad (*akusala*).[558]

Since bodily action (*kāyakamma*) and vocal action (*vacīkamma*) are good or bad, the material of information by way of the body (*kāyaviññatti*) and of information by way of the voice (*vacīviññatti*), which is included in the physical and vocal actions, is good or bad.

21. Form (*rūpa*) is maturation (*vipāka*).[559]

Just as mind factors (*dhamma*) and mental events (*cittaceatsika*) produced (*uppanna*) as a consequence of the accomplishment (*katatta*) of action (*kamma*) are <126> maturation, the form produced as a result of accomplishment of action is maturation.

22. There are intermediate stages (*antarika*) between the meditations (*jhāna*).[560]

In the fivefold method (*pañcakanaya*), there are five distinct (*vibhatta*) meditations and only (*kevalaṃ*) three contemplations (*samādhi*) appear (*udiṭṭha*). The appearance (*olāsa*) of the contemplation without investigation but with analysis (*avitakhavicāramatta*), which is between (*antare*) the first and second meditations, is called intermediate stage of meditation.

23. The aggregates remain stable even at another time.[561]

24. The passions (*rāga*) do not occur by way of the gate (*dvāra*) of the five consciousnesses. They [the five consciousnesses] are not separate from the passions.[562]

25. The Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*) has twelve mind moments (*cittakṣāṇa*). Beyond that, one remains estabished in the fruition *(phalasthita*).[563]

26. The knowable (*jñeya*) is both expressible (*abhilāpya*) and inexpressible (*anabhilāpya*).[564]

27. The object condition *(ālambanapratyaya*) of a consciousness (*vijñāna*) is that which gives rise to it (*janayati*).[565]

28. Information by way of the body (*kāyavijñapti*) is movement (*gati*).[566]

29. The characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) must be attributed to a given extended state.[567]

---

556 *Ibid*., XIV, 7.
557 *Ibid*., XV, 11.
558 *Ibid*., XVI, 7.
559 *Ibid*., XVI8.
560 Ibid., XVIII, 7.
561 Vinītadeva, thesis 2. Withou a commentary, the meaning of this thesis is enigmatic.
562 *Ibid*., thesis 3.
563 *Ibid*., thesis 4.
564 *Ibid*, thesis 5. Without a commentary, the meaning of this thesis is enigmatic.
565 L.V.P.: *Kośa*, IX, p. 295, n. 4.
566 *Ibid*., p. 48.
567 Ibid., p. 67.

30. There is an indestructible (*avipraṇāśa*) thing that is dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[568]

This indestructible [thing] is undoubtedly the same as what Candrakīrti defines thus: "When action arises, there also arises in the series a thing dissociated from the mind, non-defined (*avyākṛta*), destroyed by practice (*bhāvanā),* which is called indestructible, which produces the fruit of the action."[569]

Most of the theses defended by the Vātsīputrīyas can also be attributed to the Sammitīyas.

According to Tāranātha, the school of the Avantakas had disappeared by the 7th century.[570] Only the Kaurukulaka school subsisted until the time of the Pāla kings (9th-10th century).[571] The whole system of this latter school had been influenced by the Mahāyāna since the 7th century when Tāranātha mentions Vimuktasena, who was born near Jvālaguhā between the Madhyadeśa and the south, as their teacher at that time.[572]

[568] Ibid., p. 71.
[569] L,V.P.: *Kośa*, IX, p. 295, n. 4.
[570] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 175.
[571] *Ibid*., p. 274.
[572] *Ibid*., p. 138.

CHAPTER XVII

The Dharmottarīyas

All the traditions agree in considering them as the first of the sects coming from the Vātsīputrīyas. According to the sources of the north-west, they appeared about the middle of the 3rd century E.N.

Their name means 'those who are superior (*uttara*) in regard to the Dharma'. According to K'ouei-ki, they derived their name from their founder Dharmottara who was a Vinaya master, or else, having a supraworldly law (*dharma*), they were superior (*uttara*) to other beings (*sattva*), whence their name: superior as to the Dharma.[573] The *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra*[574] and Bhavya (1st list) likewise state that their name came from their founder Dharmottara, Vinaya master.

According to Paramārtha, the Dharmottarīyas were one of the four sects who completed the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Vātsīputrīyas, also called *Śāriputrābhidharma* or *Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharma* in nine parts, by the treatises (*śāstra*), basing themselves on the meaning of the Sūtras.[575]

The Sammatīya tradition cited by Bhavya places them beside the Bhadrayānīyas in the sub-group of the Mahāgirīyas, those who live in the high mountains (*mahāgiri*).

Inscriptions of the 2nd century of our era attest to their presence at Kārle, Soparaka and Junnar,[576] in the mountains of the Bombay area, which may without doubt be identified with the Mahāgiri of whom we have already spoken.

We know little of their doctrine. According to Bhavya, they maintained the same thesis as the Bhadrayānīyas, that is to say.:

In birth (*jāti*) there is ignorance (*avidyā)* and birth; in cessation (*nirodha*), there is ignorance and cessation.

In the absence of any commentary, it is difficult to interpret this proposition which seems very commonplace for Buddhism.

According to Vasumitra, they taught a special interpretation of the following stanza:

"Having already been liberated, one falls back again.

Regression comes from passion; one comes back again.

Chapter XVII
[573] K'ouei-ki: II, p. 6b.
[574] T.S. 468, p. 501b.
[575] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 23 and 58.
[576] Hultzsch: *Ep. Ind*., vol. VII, 1902-3, p. 54-55; Lüders: *Ep. Ind*., vol. X, 1912, Appendices, no. 1094, 1095, 1152; Burgess: *ASWI*, vol. IV, 1883, p. 91-93.

Having attained the place of calm and joy, this is happiness.

Following the practices of happiness, this is complete happiness."

In his commentary, K'ouei-ki states their opinion on this point: the Arhant has the dharmas of regression (*parihāni*), stability (*sthiti*) and progress; the first two lines concern regression, the third concerns stability and the fourth, progress.[577] <128>

[577] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 29b-30a. Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 253 seq.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Bhadrayānīyas

All the sources agree in considering the Bhadrayānīyas as one of the sects coming from the Vātsīputrīyas and name them as second, immediately after the Dhamottarīyas. According to the sources of the north-west, they appeared about the middle of the 3rd century E.N.

Their name means 'those whose way (*yāna*) is happy (*bhadra*)'.[578] According to K'ouei-ki, Bhadra was the name of the teacher of the school and *yāna* means 'descent, heritage'. This is how he interprets the translation of Hiuan-tsang, *hien-tcheou*. According to him, the name should then be understood as '[spiritual] heritage of the Arhant Bhadra'.[579]

Paramārtha says that the Bhadrayānīyas were one of the four sects that completed the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Vātsīputrīyas, also called *Śāriputrābhidharma* or *Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharma* in nine parts, by means of the treatises, by relying on the meaning of the Sūtras.[580]

The Sammatīya tradition cited by Bhavya places them, beside the Dhamottarīyas, in the sub-group of the Mahāgiriyas, i.e., those who live in the high mountains (*mahāgiri*).

Inscriptions of the 2nd century of our era attest to their presence at Nāsik and Kanheri in the mountains situated in the Bombay area,[581] which are undoubtedly the Mahāgiri who have just been mentioned.

We know little of their doctrine. According to Bhavya, they maintained the same thesis as the Dharmottariyas, that is to say:

> In birth *(jāti*), there is ignorance (*avidyā)* and birth; in cessation (*nirodha*), there is ignorance and cessation.

According to Vasumitra, they had a special interpretation of the following stanza:

> Being already liberated, one regresses.
> Regression comes from passion; one returns again.
> Having attained the place of joy and calm, this is happiness.
> If one follows the practices of happiness, this is perfect happiness.

Chapter XVIII
[578] Bhavya, 1st list.
[579] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 6b.
[580] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 23 nd 58.
[581] Hultzch: *Ep. Ind*., vol. VIII, 190506, p. 61-62; Lüders: *Ep. Ind*., vol. X, 1912, Appendices no. 987, 1018; Burgess: *ASWI*, vol. IV, 1883, p. 110-111.

In his commentary, K'ouei-ki states the opinion of the Bhadrayānīyas on this point: the first two lines apply to the Arhat who can thus <129> regress; the third line concerns the Pratyekabuddha and the last line refers to the Buddhas themselves.[582]

Finally, the Kāthavatthu ascribes one thesis to them:

1. The clear realization (*abhisamaya*) of the four Truths (*sacca*) and the Fruits (*phala*) is progressive (*anupubbena*).[583] <130>

[582] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 30a. Cf. L. V. P.: Kośa, VI, p. 267 and n. 2.
[583] *Kathāvatthu*, II, 9. See thesis 4 of the Andhakas.

CHAPTER XIX

The Saṇṇagarikas or Saṇḍagiriyas

All the traditions agree in considering them as the last sect coming from the Vātsiputrīyas. According to the sources of the north-west, they appeared towards the middle of the 3rd century C.E.

Their name means 'those of six (*ṣaṣ*) cities (*nagara*)'. It is often interpreted, especially in Chinese, as *ṣaṇḍagiriya*, 'those who dwell on the mountain (*giri*) of bushes *(ṣaṇḍa*)'. The *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra*, which refers to this last form, interprets it as the name of their residence.[584] K'ouei-ki interprets the form translated by Hiuan-tsang, 'sect of the mountain of dense forest', by saying that the Saṇḍagiriyas derived their name from the place of residence of their teacher, a thick forest, from the luxuriant vegetation and situated near a mountain.[585]

According to Paramārtha, the Saṇṇagarikas were one of the four sects that completed the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Vātsīputrīyas, also called *Śāriputrābhidharma* or *Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharma* in nine parts, by treatises *(śāstra*), by depending on the meaning of the *Sūtras*.[586]

The tradition of the Sammitiyas cited by Bhavya states that opinions were divided on the question whether the Saṇṇagarikas were attached to the Sannatīyas or to the Mahāgiriyas (Dharmottarīyas and Bhadrayānīyas).

We do not know the size of their geographic domain. Undoubtedly they lived in the west of India with the other sects of the same group.

Only Vasumitra and K'ouei-ki tell us a little about their doctrine. They interpreted differently the stanza:

> Being already delivered, one chooses anew.
> Falling comes from passion; one comes back again.
> Having obtained the place of calm joy is happiness.
> If one follows the practices of happiness, this is perfect happiness.

According to K'ouei-ki, they interpret it as follows: There are six kinds of wise men (*aśaikṣa*), i.e., Arhant, who are characterized respectively by withdrawal (*parihāṇi*), cogitation (*cetanā),* protection (*anurakṣanā),* stability (*sthitā),* penetration (*prativedhanā)* and unshakability (*akopya*); he who is already delivered is the second one; he who can fall back is the first; he who falls back into the passions as a result of his fall is the third; he who returns is the fourth; the third line concerns the fifth and the last line the sixth.[587] <131>

---

584 T. S. 468, p. 501b.
585 K'ouei-ki: II, p. 7a.
586 Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 23 and 58.
587 K'ouei-ki, III, p. 30b.

CHAPTER XX

The Sarvāstivādin Vaibhāṣikas

Along with the Theravādins, the Sarvāstivādins are the two sects that we know the best. The Sarvāstivādins have transmitted to us, particularly in their Chinese and Tibetan translations, their entire *Tripiṭaka* as well as their major post-canonical works, the entire grouping making up a mine of information of inestimable value.

They became detached from the Sthavira trunk after the Haimavatas and the Vātsīputrīyas. Although the facts of the problem of their origin are extremely clouded, a certain number of indices tend to place the schism giving rise to them in the reign of Aśoka, in 244 or 243 B.C.E., after a synod held at Pāṭaliputra presided over by a certain Maudgalyāyana or Moggaliputta, which rejected the theory of the *sarvāstivāda* in the name of orthodoxy.

Their name means 'those who teach that everything (i.e., notably the past, the future and the present) exists (*sarvam asti*)' and thus shows that they derive their origin from the defense of this thesis.

According to Paramārtha, on the death of Kātyāyanīputra, the Sthaviras split into two sects, the Sthaviras and the Sarvāstiv·ins. "The reason for this schism was that the Sthāvirīya school propagated the Sūtras only; they took the Sūtras as the correct norm" whereas "the Sarvāstivāda school, on the other hand, claimed that nothing was superior to the Abhidharma, and propagated this Basket to the detriment of the other two."[588] K'ouei-ki cites another explanation: the schism was due to the fact that some Sthaviras had then rejected the five theses of Mahādeva.[589] But these two explanations hardly have any value, for they rest on the Sarvāstivādin tradition represented by Vasumitra which classifies all the Sthaviras, except for the Haimavatas, among the Sarvāstivādins. We have seen that this is a grossly inexact claim.[590]

Their history is very poorly known to us, despite their abundant literature. It is not without great difficulty that one can extract, from the vast assemblage of legends that they have left for us, some elements of historical value.

Profiting from the extension of Aśoka's empire and undoubtedly also from the failure of the Sarvāstivādins at the Pāṭaliputra synod,[591] one of them, Madhyāntika, went to convert Kashmir,[592] which became for 1,000 years at least their principal stronghold. This Madhyāntika was a disciple of Ānanda and belonged originally to the community of Mathurā.[593] The region of Mathurā and even <132> the upper basin of the

[588] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 53-54.
[589] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 4a.
[590] See above, Part I, chap. I.
[591] As suugested by the account in *Vibhāsā* T. S. 1545, pp. 511c-512a.
[592] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, pp. 2-3, 46-61, 339-42; *Mahāvaṃsa*, XII, beginning.
[593] Przylusji: op. cit., pp. 50-53, 56-60.

Ganges and the Yamunā between this city and Sthāneśvara was always a home of the Sarvāstivādins, but they were not alone there. In the middle of the 2nd century C.E., they benefited widely from the generosity of the famous king Kaniṣka. Inscriptions dating from the latter's reign confirm this fact.[594] At that time, the Sarvāstivādins were present in the region of Peshawar in the west of Kashmir, at Mathurā and at Śrāvastī, one of the holy Buddhist cities. At that time, as these inscriptions tell us, the Sarvāstivādin *Tripiṭaka* was finished. The legend places a synod under Kaniṣka, unndoubtedly belonging to the Sarvāstivādins, in which either their *Abhidharmapiṭaka* or the enormous commentary on it, the *Vibhāsā,* was set down.[595] The latter text itself tells us that it was written quite a long time after Kaniṣka's reign. La Vallée Poussin correctly notes that the oldest account that we have of this council does not name the king under whose reign it took place and deduces from it that "probably the king did not call the council and that there had been no council." It is possible that this synod had been a particular reunion of the Sarvāstivādins held in Kashmir in the 1st century C.E.[596] in which the Canon of this sect was written down. This reunion was the counterpart for the Sarvāstivādins of Kashmir of the reunion held under king Vaṭṭagāmani of Ceylon during which (about 15 C.E.) the *Tipiṭaka* of the Ceylonese Theravādins was written down. According to Paramārtha, it was Kātyāyanīputra who presided over the council of Kashmir. The later Kashmirian tradition attributes to Vasumitra the directing of the compilation of the *Mahāvibhāṣā.* We have no means to verify these two statements. One fact is certain: a small Abhidharma treatise, evidently post-canonical, having been translated at the middle of the 2nd century C.E. by Ngan Che Kao,[597] seems to indicate that at this epoch the compilation of the treatises of this order had already begun some time before. One would not be too far wrong in referring the setting down of the Sarvāstivādin *Tripiṭika* to the 1st century C.E. The *Vibhāṣā* attributed to Kātyāyanīputra[598] may date from about the year 100, and the *Mahāvibhāṣā* attributed to Vasumitra, the plan of which is clearly different and which represents an enormous volume, may date from about the year 200.[599]

The *Mahāvibhāṣā* frequently cites the names and doctrines of many Sarvāstivādin teachers, thus furnishing a *terminus ad quem* for them. There are specially Pārśva, Vasumitra, Ghosaka, Buddhadeva, Dharmatrāta and another scholar designated only by his title of Bhadanta.[600] Others are cited much more rarely: Kuśavarman, Ghisavarman, Drava, Daradatta, Dharmanandin, Dhārmika, Subhūti, Pūrṇasa, Bakkula, Vāmaka, Śamadatta, Saṃghavasu, Buddharakṣita, Parmi. Amongst them, there are many who have

---

[594] Sten Konow: C. I. I.: vol. II, part I*: Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions*, pp. 48-49, 137, 145, 155; Hultzsch: *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. VIII, pp. 131, 176, 177, 179.

[595] Cf: L. V. P.: *L'Inde aux temps des Maurya*, pp. 326-8, which gives references; Przyluski: op. cit., p. 206.

[596] Since the inscriptions at Sārnāth and Śrāvastī mention the Sarvāstivādin *Tripiṭaka* in the 3rd year of Kaniṣka's reign. Cf. Hultzsch, note above.

[597] T. S. 1557.The condition of the language used by the translator leaves no doubt about the epoch when he lived.

[598] T. S. 1547. Translated into Chinese in 383 by Saṃghabhūti.

[599] T. S. 1546, partially translated into Chinese by Buddhavarman and Tao-t'ai in 439; T. S. 1545, completely translated by Hiuan-tsang in 658-659.

[600] Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, pp XLIII-LI, and index.

undergone more or less influence from the Sautrāntikas.[601] The *Mahāvibhāṣā* mentions that even in the 2nd century, there were several different schools among the <133> Sarvāstivādins, some of which were more or less dissident: the Yuktavādins, orthodox; the Abhidharmācāryas, i.e., those who understood correctly the meaning of the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* and opposed the heretical Sautrāntikas; the Kaśmīrācāryas, teachers of the Kashmir school; the Gandhārācāryas, teachers of the Gandhāra school, who may be identified with the Pāścātīyas, those of the west, and with the Bahirdeśakas, the foreigners. Among the Sarvāstivādins also, as a result, geographical distribution was one of the major causes of division.

At an undetermined epoch somewhere between the beginning of our era and the year 400 C.E.,[602] there lived successively three masters who worked on a treatise entitled *Abhidharmasāra* or *Abhidharmahṛdaya*: Dharmaśrī, Upaśānta and Dharmatrāta. If this last master may indeed be identified as the Dharmatāta so often cited in the *Mahāvibhāsā* as La Valée Poussin believes not without excellent reasons, these three scholars thus lived between the years 0 and 200 of our era, which is in no way impossible.

Nothing precise is known about these three different masters. Legends and confused traditions or even contradictions that mention them give not the slightest historical indication about them. We can assume that in some cases there were several famous individuals baring the same names: several Vasumitras, several Dharmatrātas, several Vasubandhus, etc. ...

If there is, as it seems, somewhat more information on the individual Vasubandhu, who lived at Puruṣapura, today Peshawar, at the center of the main Sarvāstivādin stronghold, and who also lived for a long time at Ayodhya, on the borders of Madhyadeśa and Magadha, other strongholds of the Sarvāstivādins but less exclusive than the first, the epoch at which he lived remains problematic. Two dates have been proposed: 300-350 or 420-500, and we must confess that the arguments for and against the one and the other make them both equally possible.[603] Vaubandhu, the author of the famous treatise entitled *Abhidharmakośaśāstra*, had undergone some Sautrāntika influence. This very important work roused very lively criticism from the orthodox Saṃghabhadra who wrote two voluminous treatises to refute him and who is considered to be contemporaneous with Vasubandhu. Later, the *Abhidharmakośa* was commented on by Guṇamati, Yaśomitra, Pūrṇavardhana, Śamathadeva and Sthiramti. At the beginning of the 6th century at Nālanadā, Guṇamati wrote the *Lakṣaṇasāraśāstra* which was inspired by the *Abhidhrmakośaśāstra*. Towards the end of his life, Guṇamati went to settle at Valabhi where he had Sthiramati as a student. The latter was the teacher of Pūrṇavardhana, who taught the Sarvāstivādin doctrine to Jinamitra and Śīlendrabodhi. In the 6th century also lived Vasuvarman, author of the *Cahuḥsatyaśāstra*, which followed closely the doctrinal line of Vasubandhu.

---

601 Cf. Chap. XXII below.

602 Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, pp. LXIII-LXVII.The work of Dharmatrāta, the most recent of the three.

603 Cf. L. V. P.: Koś, Introuction, pp. XXIV-XXVIII, which summarize the discussion and give references. See also E. Frauwallner: *On the date of the buddhist master of the law Vasubandhu*, Serie Orientale Roma III, 1951, which distinguishes two Vasubandhus, the second, born about 400 at an unknown place, being the Sarvāstivādin master.

When Hiuan-tsang visited India in the second part of the 7th century, he noted the presence of the Sarvāstivādins in many places: 300 monks at Tamavāsana (region of Sialkot), 500 at Matipur (south-east of Sthānaśvara), 500 at Navadevakula (near Kanauj), 200 at Ayamukha (between Ayodhyā and Prayāda), 2,000 at Vārāṇasī (in the north of Gijerat) for India proper; 2,000 at

Karachar, <134> 5,000 at Koucha, 1,000 at Bāluka, 300 at Gaz Darah (between Balk and Bāmiyan), 500 at Khabandha and 1,000 at Wu-sa (Pamir), 1,000 at Kachgar and a few at Niya. This represents some 16,000 monks living in some 300 monasteries of which only 5,000 monks and 50 monasteries were in India proper. But it is fitting to add that Hiuan-tsang does not always specify, not by a long shot, to which sects the monks belonged whom he met on his travels. It is quite certain that the 5,000 monks living in the 100 monasteries the existence of which he notes in Kashmir were Sarvāstivādins. There must also have been a large number of Sarvāstivādins among the 2,000 undetermined monks at Jālandhāra, the 700 at Sthāneśvara, the 1,000 at Śrughna, the 2.000 at Mathurā, the 10, 000 at Kanauj, the 3,000 at Ayodhyā, the thousands at Nālandā, the 1,000 of the lan of the Vṛjji, the 2,000 in Nepal, the 3,000 at Puṇyavardhana. The evidence of I-tsing, half a century later, allows us to affirm it. In so little time, the situation could hardly have changed and, if Hiuan-tsang notes the presence of 17,000 Sammatīya monks in the Ganges basin while I-tsing considers that the Sarvāstivādins were the most numerous in this region, we will not be too far wrong in estimating the number of Sarvāstivādins residing in this part of India at the middle of the 7th century as about 20,000. It is not without sadness that Hiuan-tsang notes the devastation of two of the main strongholds of the Sarvāstivādins, Gandhāra and Uḍḍiyāna; almost all the inhabitants are non-Buddhist; the ruins of about 2,500 monasteries lie there deserted in which once lived perhaps more than 30,000 monks.[604] The decline, due to poorly discernible causes, had been so rapid that Song-yun, who crossed through this region 110 years earlier, saw it in the full splendor of victorious Buddhism.[605]

At the end of the 7th century, I-tsing established the geographic distribution of Sarvāstivmadins thus: the north, i.e., Kashmir and neighboring regions, is their almost exclusive stronghold; they are most numerous at Magadha, i.e., in the basin of the upper and mid-Ganges; they are encountered at the side of the other sects in the East, i.e., in Bengal; they have some representatives in the west, in Gujerat and at Malva, and in the south, in the Dekkhan. They are in the majority in the Islands of the Sonde and in the whole of the south of China and a few are met at Champa.

We are poorly informed on the subsequent destiny of the Sarvāstivādins in India. According to Taranātha, they were still represented at the time of the Pāla kings (9th to 10th centuries) by the Mūlasarvāstivādin school.

In China, the translation of the *Abhidharmakośaśāstra* by Hiuan-tsang in 651-654 provoked the appearance of a new sect that took this work as its basis and thus can be considered as a Chinese branch of the Sarvāstivādins. It remained flourishing until the end of the 9th century, then declined and disappeared

[604] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, pp. 199-230.
[605] Chavannes: *Voyage de Song-Yun*, pp. 30-43.

quickly because its doctrine was too scholastic and too dry for the Chinese taste.[606] Its only notable representative was P'ou Kouang, disciple of Hiuan-tsang, who wrote a commentary on the *Abhidharmakośaśāstra* between 650 and 655 at Tchang-ngan. This sect was introduced to Japan in 658 by the Chinese monks Tchi-tsu and Tch-ta-tsu, but it has disappeared there also long ago.[607]

According to some late texts, the Sarvāstivādins had as their teacher Rāhula or Rāhulabhadra, a Kṣātriya, their language was Sanskrit, their emblem an *utpala* lotus, a *padma* lotus flower, a jewel and the leaf of a tree. They wore a cloak of twenty-five to twenty-nine strips or nine to twenty-five strips. Their names ended with *-mati, -śrī, -prabhā, -kīrti* and *–bhadra* preferentially.[608]

According to two older works, the Sarvāstivādins were distinguished by their erudition and their perspicacity, and propagated the Dharma widely. Their garments were black or dark red.[609]

I-tsing gives us some information on particular customs of the Sarvāstivādins. They cut the bottom of their cloak in a straight line. Each monk had his own cell. They received their alms-food directly into their hands (i.e., into the begging-bowl which they carried in their hands). They wore their bottom robe by folding both of the side sections. It was made of one piece of cloth five cubits long and two cubits wide, of silk or of linen.[610] Describing the customs of the Sarvāstivādins of whom he was a part, I-tsing also gives much further information about them.

The Sarvāstivādin literature is well known to us for the Chinese and Tibetan translations have preserved their most important works.

Their *Tripiṭaka* consists of:

I. *Vinatapiṭaka*:[611]	1-3) *Pratimokṣa*
(10 recitations)	
	4) *Saptadharma*.
	5) *Aṣṭadharma*.
	6) *Kṣudrakaparivarta*.
	7) *Bhikṣuṇīvinaya*.
	8) *Ekottaradharma*.
	9) *Upāliparipṛcchā.*
	10) *Kuśalaparivarta*.
II. *Sūtrapiṭaka* (5):	1) *Dīrgha-Agama*.
(4 *āgama*)	2) *Madhyama-Agama*.
	3) *Samyukta-Agama*.

606 606 Ch. Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism*, III, pp. 314-315; Io: *Japanese Buddhism*, p. 173.
607 Io*: Japanese Buddhism*, p. 212.
608 Lin-Li-Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, pp. 176-178, 181 and 197-201.
609 T. S. 1465, p. 900c; T. S. 1470, p. 925c; Lin Li Kouang: op. cit. Pp. 80-81.
610 Takakusu: *A record of buddhist religion*, pp. 7, 66, 75.
611 T. S. 1435 to 1439 and 1441.

4) *Ekottara-Agama*.

III. *Abhidharmapiṭaka* (6): 1) *Jñānaprathāna*.
(6 *āāda ??*) 2) *Saṇgītiparyāyapāda*.
3) *Dharmaskandhapāda*.
4) *Prajñaptipāda*.[612]
5) *Vijñānakāyapāda*.
6) *Dhātukāyapāda*.
7) *Prakaraṇapāda*.

The most important of the works corresponding to those that constitute the Pāli *Khuddakanikāya* also exist, but they were not included in the Canon. There are also the collections of *Jātakas* and *Avadānas*, a *Dharmapada* and an <135> *Udānavarga*, without counting other works having been lost today. We may mention only the *Avadānaśataka*, the *Divyāvadāna*, the *Aśokāvadāna* which are connected especially with the Mūlasarvāstivādin school whose enormous *Vinayapiṭaka* includes many works of this order.

The literature of the canonical large commentaries is well represented. Although it is reduced to a single rather short work on the Vinaya,[613] we possess two different *Vibhāṣā*s commenting on the *Abhidharmapiṭaka*.[614] The more important of these two, an enormous collective work full of precious information on the doctrines of the various Sarvāstivādin schools and other sects, is more precisely a commentary on the *Jñānaprasthānaśāstra*. Its doctrinal importance was such that it represented the most definite criterion of orthodoxy and gave its name to the most orthodox school of the Sarvāstivādins, the Vaibhāṣika.

Apart from these works of canonical nature, we have a whole series of diverse treatises the doctrinal nuances of which are of great interest to the history of ideas. The can be classified into groups.

The oldest of these is undoubtedly that which is represented by three short treatises entitled *Pañcavastu* or *Pañcadharma*, and of which one is attributed to Dharmatrāta, the other two being anonymous.[615] One of the latter dates from as late as the beginning of the 2nd century C.E.[616] All three deal with the classification of things (*dharma*) into five classes particular to the Sarvāstivādins; mind (*citta*), mental events (*caitta*), dissociated from mind (*cittaviprayukta*), matter (*rūpa*) and non-composites (*asaṃskṛta*).

The second group is made up of the *Abhidharmasāra* or *Abhidharmahṛdaya* of Dharmaśrī, Upaśanta and Dharmatrāta.[617] These are treatises of medium length written along the same plan and including ten chapters: elements (*dhātu*), composites (*saṃskāra*), actions (*karman*), latent tendencies (*anuśaya*), career of

[612] *Tanjur-Mdo*, vol. LXII, 2 and 3.
[613] T. S. 1440.
[614] T. S. 1547 and T. S. 1545 and 1546.
[615] T. S. 1555, 1556, 1557.
[616] T. S. 1557.
[617] T. S. 1550, 1551 and 1552.

the noble ones *(ārya*), knowledges (*jñāna*), contemplations (*samādhi*), *Sūtra*s, mixtures (*saṃyukta*) and treatises (*śāstra*).

Apart from these two groups, we may mention three isolated treatises. One bears Vasumitra's name, is of medium length and treats the different questions of the Abhidharma in fourteen chapters.[618] The *Abhidharmāmṛtarasa* by Ghosa, rather short despite its sixteen chapters, is of the same type as the preceding.[619] The *Abhidharmāvatāraprakaraṇā* by Skandhila, the teacher of Saṃghabhadra, is shorter and deals in a very concise way with very diverse Abhidharma problems.[620]

A place must be set apart for the *Lokaprajñapti*, undoubtedly a very old work which is a Buddhist description of the world with its kingdoms, parks, cities, hells, cataclysms. etc. ...[621]

Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* in its two forms, *kārikā* or verse summary, and *śāstra* or *bhāsya*, prose development, are placed in the 4th or 5th century. This work in nine chapters is, thanks to its translator, La Vallée Poussin, too well known for us to spend too much time on it here. The abundant literature <137> it has provoked which has largely been conserved for us, should be mentioned: commentaries by Guṇamati, Sthiramati, Puṇyacardhana, Yaśomitra,[622] not to forget the vast *Nyāyānusara* by Saṃghabhadra who criticized it strongly.[623]

There remains to be mentioned the *Catuḥsatyaśāstra* by Vasuvarman, a treatise of medium length dealing with the four Truths as its title indicates,[624] and the *Lakṣanānusāra* by Guṇamati, much shorter - or rather what remains of it - and which sets forth the sixteen aspects *(ākāra*) of the Truths.[625]

Here are the theses of the Sarvāstivādins:

1. Everything (*sarvaṃ)* exists (*asti*). The past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) exist really and substantially. [626]

This is their fundamental thesis.

The Blessed One said in a *Sūtra*: " O monks, if past form (*rūpa*) did not exist, the holy *śrāvaka* would not fail to take past form into consideration ... If future form did not exist, the holy *śrāvaka* would not fail to take pleasure in future form. It is because future form exists that the holy *śrāvaka* ..." And again: " Consciousness (*vijñāna*) is produced due to two things. – What are these two? – The organ of sight (*cakṣurindriya*) and the visible (*rūpa*), mind (*manas*) and things (*dharma*)." But it is impossible that, in a given individual (*pudgala*) two minds (*citta*) exist at the same time, in particular, that of the object

[618] T. S. 1549.
[619] T. S. 1553.
[620] T. S. 1554, *Tanjur Mdo*, LXX, 5 and 4 (anonymous commnetary).
[621] T. S. 1644, *Tanjur-Mdo*, LXII, 1.
[622] T. S. 1561, *Mdo* LXV to LXX.
[623] T. S. 1562 and 1563, *Mdo*, LXIV, 2.
[624] T.S. 1647.
[625] T. S. 1641.
[626] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 3. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 49-65. T. S. 1539, pp. 531a-537a; T. S. 1545, pp. 393a-396b. *Kathāvatthu*, I, 6.

(ālambana) to be cognized and that of the cognizing agent. Consequently, the one will be past when the other appears and the latter will still be future at the time when the first arises. If then past and future things did not exist, there could not be a meeting between the cognizing agent an its object, and in sum, cognition would be impossible. There is cognition of past and future things, notably in the act of memorizing and the act of prediction which are ordinary experience. If past and future things did not exist, this cognition would be impossible since it would have no object, all cognition needing to have a really existent object. On the other hand, a given individual cannot accomplish an action (*karman*) and receive its fruit of maturation (*vipākaphala*) simultaneously. When the action is accomplished, its fruit of maturation is a future thing and, when the agent receives this fruit, the action that gave rise to it is a past thing. If past and future things did not exist, past actions, being non-existent, would not produce fruits."

2. Everything is included (*saṃgṛhīta*) in name (*nāman*) and form (*rūpa*) (matter).[627]

The characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*) of form is its grossness (*sthūlatā*). It is easy to know that a substance of this sort should be designated as form. The substance of the other four aggregates (*skandha*) and the non-composites (*asaṃskṛta*) is subtle (*sūkṣma*), concealed, difficult to know. Because it presents the appearance of the name, it is designated as name.[628]

3. All the domains of the mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*) are <138> completely cognizable (*jñeya*), perceptible to the consciousness (*vijñeya*) and comprehensible (*abhijñeya*).[629]

Since the mind (*citta*) or spirit (*manas*) and mental things (*caitta*) that constitute the domain of mental phenomena, the specific object of the mind, have the same substance (*dravya*) and the same characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*), mental phenomena are completely cognizable, perceptible to the consciousness and comprehensible.

4. The characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of birth (*jati*), decline (*vyaya*), duration (*sthiti*) and impermanence (*anityatā),* as well as that which is dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*) are included (*saṃgṛhita*) in the aggregate of mental formations (*saṃskāraskandha*).[630]

The characteristics of the composites (*saṃskṛta*), truly existing and being themselves composite, must therefore be included in the aggregates as well as things disassociated from the mind. Since neither the ones nor the others can be classed in any of the other four aggregates, they are therefore included in the agregate of the mental formations.

5. Composite things (*saṃskṛta*) are of three kinds: past (*atīya*), future (*anāgata*) and present (*pratyutpanna*).[631]

The three times are composite because they arise as a result of causes (*hetu*) and conditions (*pratyaya*) and they exert an activity.

---

[627] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 1. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, pp. 94-95; T. S. 1545, pp. 71c-75b.
[628] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 11b.
[629] Vasumitra, thesis 3. T. S. 1537, p. 500c; T. S. 1541, p. 646bc; T. S. 1542, p. 713c; T. S. 1545, p. 976c.
[630] Vasumitra, thesis 3. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, pp. 29, 40. T. S. 1545, p. 198b.
[631] Vasumitra,thesis 4. L. V. P.: Kośa, I, pp. 11-12; T. S. 1545, p. 74b. 85b. 190a, 479a. 919a.

6. Non-composite things (*saṃskṛta*) are of three types: cessation due to discriminative knowledge (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*), cessation without discriminative knowledge (*apratisaṃkhyānirodha*), space *(ākāśa*).[632]

7. The characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of composites (*saṃskṛta*) are distinct and exist truly and substantially.[633]

There are four (and not three, as Vasumitra and Bhavya claim) characteristics of composites: production (*utpāda*), decline (*vyaya*) or change (*anyathatva*) and impermanence (*anityatā)* or cessation (*nirodha*). Each of them truly exists, is itself composite and provided with its own distinct nature.

8. The Truth (*satya*) of cessation (*nirodha*) is non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*), but the other three Truths are composite (*saṃskṛta*).[634]

The Truth of cessation, being identical with *nirvāṇa*, i.e., with *pratisaṃkhyānirodha*, is non-composite. The other three Truths are not so.

9. Clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the four noble Truths *(āryasatya*) is progressive (*anupūrva*).[635]

The Blessed One has said in a *Sūtra*: " There is, O householder, clear progressive understanding of the four noble Truths, but not unique clear understanding (*ekābhisamaya*). Whoever, O householder, says: 'Without having clearly understood (*anabhisametya*) the noble Truth of suffering, I clearly understand (*abhisameṣyāmi*) the noble Truth of the origin..., I completely understand the noble Truth of the path that leads to the cessation of suffering'

<139> should not speak thus. – Why? – It is as unsuitable (*asthāna*) and impertinent (*anavakāśa*) to say 'Without having understood...' as to say, "O householder: 'Without having established (*apratiṣṭhāpya*) the foundations (*mūlapada*) of the top storey (*kūṭāgāra*) or a room situated on the top storey (*kūṭāgāraśālā),* I will establish (*pratiṣṭhāpayiṣyāmi*) the walls (*bhitti*). Without having established the walls, I will establish the ceiling (*talaka*). Without having established the ceiling, I will establish the roof (*chadana*).' One must not speak in that way." And also: "The one who speaks thus: 'Not having mounted up on the first flight (*prathamasopānakaḍevara*) of a staircase (*sopāna*) of four flights (*catuḥkaḍevara*), I will mount up (*abhirokṣyāmi*) onto the second (*dvitīya*). Not having mounted up to the second...' must not speak ion this way. – Why? It is also unsuitable and impertinent to say ...". And also: "And so, here too, there is no reason that, not having seen (*adṛṣṭvā)* the Truth of suffering, one sees (*drakṣyati*) the Truth of the origin... The noble Ānanda spoke thus: 'What then, O venerable One, is the clear understanding of the four noble Truths?' - ...Just as , O Ānanda, one would say: 'Not having mounted up on the first (*prathama*) flight of a staircase (*niḥśreṇīpāda*) of a staircase (*niḥśreṇī*) of four flights (*catuṣpadikā),* I will mount up to the terrace (*prāsāda*)...', because of the variety of the aspects *(ākāra*) of the four Truths, it is impossible to maintain

---

[632] Vasumitra, thesis 4; Vinītadeva, thesis 3. L. V. P.: Kośa, I, pp. 7-11; T. S. 1537, p. 505a; T. S. 1541, P. 627a; T. S. 1542, p. 694ab; T. S. 1545, p. 65a.

[633] Vasumitra, thesis 4; Bhavya, thesis 5. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 226 seq. T. S. 1545, p. 198abc.

[634] Vasumitra, thesis 4,. T. S. 1536, p. 392a; T. s. 1545, pp. 34c, 985b.

[635] Vasumitra, thesis 5; Bhavya, thesis 6. L. V. P.: Kośa, VI, p. 185-188 and VII, p. 31. T. S. 1545, p. 533ab and 405a-406a. Kathāvatthu, ii, 9. See thesis 4 of the Andhakas.

that clear understanding takes place in one single time because 'one does not see the origin, etc,.... under the aspects of suffering.' Moreover, clear understanding does not consist only of seeing the shared characteristics of the Truths as their aspect of impermanence (*anātmākāra*), but does consist in seeing the self-characteristics of each of them, and that at all stages of the Path, 'for one cultivates the Truths in the same way that one has seen them.'

10. By depending on the contemplations of emptiness (*śūnya*) and wishlessness (*apraṇihita*) together, one can enter into the complete assurance of eventual attainment of enlightenment (*samyaktvaniyāma*).[636]

The two contemplations concern the aspects *(ākāra*) of the Truth of suffering (*duḥkhasatya*). The contemplation on emptiness has as object the two empty and selfless (*anātman*) aspects, and the contemplation of wishlessness the two impermanent (*anitya*) and suffering (*duḥkha*) aspects. Consequently, when one takes one's support on these two contemplations, one contemplates the four aspects of the Truth of suffering and thus one enters onto the Path of deliverance.

11. By meditating on lust (*kāma*), one can enter into the complete assurance of the eventual attainment of enliughtenment (*samyaktvaniyāma*).[637]

12. When one has entered into the complete assurance of the eventual attainment of enlkightenment (*samyaktvaniyāma*), at the moment of the first fifteen productions of mind (*cittotpāda*), one is called 'oriented' (*pratipanna*), at the sixteenth moment, one is called 'fruit of residing' (*sthitiphala*).[638]

In regard to the Truth of suffering, one successively produces: *1*) a presentiment of knowledge of the thing (*dharmajñānakṣānti*), bearing upon the suffering of the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) which is the entry into the assurance of attianment; 2) a knowledge of the thing (*dharmajñāna*) having the same object; *3*) a subsequent knowledge of presentiment (*anvayajñānakṣānti*), bearing on the suffering of the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*); *4*) a subsequent <140> knowledge (*anvayajñāna*) having the same object. Similarly for the other three Truths, thus sixteen minds in all. But the sixteenth mind is no longer part of the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*) since there is nothing more to be seen that has not been seen. It meditates on the truth such as it has seen, and thus is part of the Path of cultivation (*bhāvanamārga*).

13. Supreme worldly things (*laukikāgradharma*) are one single instantaneous mind (*ekakṣaṇikacitta*). Supreme worldly things are determined (*niyata*) and without regressing (*parihāṇi*), whereas the three things of the path of preparation (*prayoga*) have regression.[639]

14. The 'Stream-enterer' (*srotāpanna*) does not regress (*parihāṇi*), but the Arhant does regress.[640]

---

[636] Vasumitra, thss=esis 6; Bhavya, thesis 7. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VIII, pp. 184-195. T. S. 1545, pp. 538a seq.
[637] Vasumitra, thesis 7. L. V. P.: Kośa, VI, pp. 195 and 232.
[638] Vasumitra, thesis 6. Bhavya, thesis 8. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, pp. 179 and 191 seq.
[639] Vaumitra, thesis 7. L. V. P.: Kośa, pp. 163 to 179. T. S. 1545, pp. 20b-22c. Very lengthy discussion impossible to summarize here.
[640] Vasumitra, thesis 8; Bhavya, theses 4 and 10. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, pp. 251-257. T. S. 1545, pp. 931b, 933 seq. *Kathāvatthu*, I, 2. See thesis 13 of the Vātsiputrīya.

15. All Arhants do not obtain the knowledge of non-production (*anutpādajñāna*).[641] Only the unshakable (*akopya*) Arhant, the one who does not regress (*parihāṇi*), obtains the knowledge of non-production. The other five Arhants, being capable of regressing, cannot obtain it.

16. The ordinary person (*pṛthagjana*) is able to abandon lust (*kāma*) and maliciousness (*vyāpāda*).[642]

By the worldly Path (*laukikamārga*), one can also abandon certain tendencies (*anuśaya*). It is said in the Sūtras that Udraka Rāmaputra, one of the the Buddha's worldly teachers before his Awakening, had abandoned the afflictions (*kleśa*) of the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*), the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and the first three stages of the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*) and that he was reborn in the realm of neither perception nor non-perception (*naivasaṃjñānāsaṃjñāyatana*).

17. The heretics (*tīrthika*) are able to obtain the five superknowledges (*abhijñā*).[643]

18. Among the gods (*deva*) there is pure conduct (*brahmacaryā).*[644]

19. In seven absorptions (*samāpatti*), the factors of Enlightenment (*bodhyaṇga*) can be obtained, not in the others.[645]

These seven absorptions are the four meditations (*dhyāna*) and the three lower formless *(ārūpya*) absorptions. In the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) and in the higher formless concentration, there are neither factors of Enlightenment nor factors of the Path (*mārgāṇga*) because in these two places, the pure (*anāsrava*) Path does not exist. The higher formless absorption is never pure as a result of the extremely subtle perception (*saṃjñā)* that alone subsists there and that hinders meditation on the Path.

20. All the meditations (*dhyāna*) are included (*saṃgrhīta*) in the foundations of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*).[646]

The factors of penetration (*nirvedhabhāgīya*) of the Path (*mārga*) of preparation (*prayoga*) are the foundations of mindfulness. The Path of seeing <141> (*darśanamārga*) is, in its nature, the foundation of mindfulness of things (*dharmasmṛtyupasthāna*). The foundations of mindfulness are wisdom (*prajñā)* by nature, thus contributing to Enlightenment *(bodhi*) and being part of the essential factors (*aṇga*) of the meditations.

21. Without depending on the meditations (*dhyāna*), one is able to enter into the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*samyakyvaniyāma*) and also the fruit of sainthood (*arhattvaphala*).[647]

Bodhisattvas and pratyekabuddhas enter into the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment by directly depending on the four meditations and entirely or partially on the four factors of penetration

---

641 Vasumitra, thesis 9. L. V. P.: Kośa, VI, p. 240.
642 Vasumitra, thesis 10; Bhavya, thesis 11. T. S. 1545, pp. 264b, 741c.
643 Vasumitra, thesis 11; Bhavya, thesis 12. L. V. P: *Kośa*, VII, pp. 97-100.
644 Vasumitra, thesis 12; Bhavya, thesis 13.
645 Vasumitra, thesis 13. L. V. P: *Kośa*, VI, pp. 290 seq; VIII, pp. 144-145 and 181-182. T. S. 1545, pp. 497b =seq and 321b seq.
646 Vasumitra, thesis 13. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, pp. 153-161. T. S. 1545, pp. 945a seq.
647 Vasumitra, thesis 13. L. V. P.: Kośa, II, pp. 205 seq; IV, pp. 220-231; VI, pp. 175-177; VIII, p. 192-195; T. S. 1545, pp. 33 ab and 417 c.

(*nirvedhabhāgīya*). The Bodhisattva does not enter into the absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*) before attaining Enlightenment (*bodhi*).

22. If one depends on the bodies of the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*), even though one can experience (*sākṣītkuryāt*) the fruit of Sainthood (*arhattvaphala*), one cannot enter into the assurance of attainment (*samyaktvaniyāma*). If one depends on the body of the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*), not only can one enter into the assurance of attainment, but one can also experience the fruit of Sainthood.[648]

In the form and formless realms, one can produce the knowledge (*jñāna*) but not the presentiment (*kṣānti*), one can produce the consecutive knowledge (*anvayajñāna*) but not the knowledge of things (*dharmajñāna*), and also one cannot feel suffering (*duḥkha*) there. For all these reasons, when one is dwelling in these higher realms, one cannot enter into the Path of deliverance. On the other hand, if one has already entered it during an earlier existence, one can continue to progress there until obtaining the fruit of Sainthood. It is only in the desire realm that the necessary conditions for entering into the Path are realized.

23. The inhabitants of Uttarakuru have no detachment (*virāga*) and noble ones *(ārya*) are not born there. Neither are they born among the non-perceiving gods (*asaṃjñideva*).[649]

Uttarakuru is the southern continent in Buddhist cosmology. Its inhabitants live in perfect happiness without feeling any suffering from which they might be revulsed, which would encourage them to become detached from the passions. The non-perceiving gods are the gods of the fourth level of the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) corresponding to the fourth *dhyāna*. During their extraordinarily long and non-perceiving life, they can only exhaust the maturation of their previous good actions without becoming detached from the world and progressing along the Path.

24. The four fruits of the religious life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*) are not necessarily obtained gradually. If one has already entered into the assurance of attainment (*samyaktvaniyāma*), by depending on the worldly Path (*laukikamārga*) one experiences (*sakṣītkaroti*) the fruits of Once-returner (*sakṛdāgāmiphala*) and of the Non-returner (*anāgāmiphala*).[650]

The person who enters into the assurance of attainment is immediately destined to one of the first three fruits according to the number of bonds <142> (*saṃyojana*) he has already cut through by means of the worldly, i.e., non-Buddhist, path. If he has not broken any of the bonds or has broken from one to five of them, he is destined to the fruit of Stream-enterer (*srotāpanna*). If he has broken six to eight bonds before having entered into the assurance of attainment, he is immediately destined to the fruit of Once-returner. If he has previously abandoned the defilements of the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) or the other realms including the realm of nothingness *(ākiñcanyāyatana*), he is immediately destined to the fruit of Non-returner. Thus the newly converted does not lose the benefit of efforts accomplished before his conversion.

---

[648] Vasumitra, thesis 14; Bhavya, thesis 15. T. S. 1545, p. 33c.

[649] Vasumitra, thesis 15. T. S. 1545, p. 33bc. L. V. P.: Kośa, VI, p. 174; IV, pp. 104, 182-183, 205. K'ouei-Ki, III, p. 17a.

[650] Vasumitra, thesis 16. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Vi, p. 243. T. S. 1545, p. 278b.

25. The four foundations of mindfulness (*smṛtyupasthāna*) can include all things (*dharma*).[651]

It is said in a Sūtra: "All things, i.e., the four foundations of mindfulness." The four foundations of mindfulness are, in fact, the body (*kāya*), sensation (*vedanā),* mind (*citta*) and the things (*dharma*), i.e., everything that can serve as object of the mind (*manas*).

26. All the habitual tendencies (*anuśaya*) are all mental events (*caitta*) associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*) and provided with an object (*sālambana*).[652]

27. All the tendencies (*anuśaya*) are entirely included in the manifestly evident afflictions (outbursts) (*paryavasthāna*), but all the outbursts are not included in the tendencies.[653]

28. The nature (*bhāva*) of the factors (*aṅga*) of co-dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) is necessarily composite (*saṃskṛta*).[654]

Since co-dependent production is included in the threefold world of which it is the fundamental law, like it, it cannot be other than composite. Moreover, if it is by being based on the stability of nature that one wants to demonstrate the non-composite character of co-dependent origination, then one must also recognize form (*rūpa*), the four great elements (*mahābhūta*), the aggregates (*skandha*), etc., as non-composite, since each of them always keeps its own nature. And yet they are manifestly composite. Therefore co-dependent origination is composite.

29. The factors (*aṅga*) of co-dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) also function in the Arhant.[655]

It is easy to show that certain members of co-dependent origination, such as consciousness (*vijñāna*), feeling (*vedanā),* name and form (*nāma-rūpa*), the six sense firlds *(ṣaḍāyatana*), contact (*sparśa*), play a rôle in the Arhant's life.

30. In the Arhant, there is increase (*vardhana*) of meritorious actions (*puṇyakarman*).[656]

When an Arhant has carried out an action producing merit, he does it in such a way that, by the power of the meditation and concentration of his mind, this action produces a retribution (*vipāka*), not in enjoyment in another lifetime since he whould no longer be reborn, but in this life *(āyus*), i.e., in increase of the present life.

31. It is only in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) and the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) that there is intermediate existence (*antarabhava*).[657] <143>

The intermediate being who makes the passage in this way from one existence to the next is formed, like every living being, of the five aggregates (*skandha*). His existence is demonstrated by the fact that it cannot have any discontinuity in time and space between the place and moment of death and those of rebirth, and therefore it must be that the two existences belonging to the same series are linked in time and space by an

---

[651] Vasumitra, thesis 17. L. V. P.: VI, pp. 158-162. T. S. 1545, p. 936c-937a.
[652] Vasumitra, thesis 18. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 4 seq. T. S. 1545, pp. 257b, 110ab.
[653] Vasumitra, thesis 19. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 73, 81, 89-91.
[654] Vasumitra, thesis 20. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, pp. 77-78. T. S. 1545, p. 116c.
[655] Vasumitra, thesis 21; K'ouei-Ki, III, pp. 17b-19a.
[656] Vasumitra, thesis 22. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 120-121. T. S. 1545, p. 656b.
[657] Vasumitra, thesis 23. L. V. P.: Kośa, III, pp. 31-50. T. S. 1545, pp. 352a seq amd 356c seq.

intermediate stage. The intermediate being is the Gandharva, the presence of which is as necessary at conception as the fecundity and union of the parents. Furthermore, the Antarāparinirvāyin is an Anāgamin who obtains *parinirvāṇa* during the intermediary existence. As for the heinous criminal guilty of one of the five crimes without interval *(ānantarya*), he passes in quite the same way by an intermediate existence at the end of which he is reborn necessarily in hell.

32. The five sensory consciousnesses (*vijñāna)* are provided with passions (*sarāga*) and are without detachment (*avirāga*).[658]

33. The five sense consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) assume only their own characteristics (*svalakṣāṇa*) and have no discrimination (*vikalpa*).[659]

The five sense consciousnesses are specialized as to their respective fields *(āyatana*) and not as to the different substances (*dravya*) that can contain these fields, for example, blue, yellow, red, etc. ... They do not assume shared characteristics, like the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) which plays a centralizing rôle. They are free of discriminating examination (*nirūpaṇāvikalpa*), i.e., of non-absorbed wisdom (*prajñā*), of the realm of the mental consciousness, and free of the discrimination consisting of memory (*anusmaraṇavikalpa*), i.e., of memory associated with the mental consciousness. But they are provided with discrimination in itself (*svabhāvavikalpa*), i.e., of conceptual examination (*vitarka*) and analysis (*vicāra*).

34. The dharmas, i.e., minds (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*), truly exist. They are provided with object *(ālambana*). Self nature (*svabhāva*) is dissociated from self nature (*svabhāvaviprayukta*). Mind is dissociated from mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[660]

The first part of the thesis is a corollary of Sarvāstivāda thesis 1. Mind and mental events having objects, their activity is efficient. Mind is dissociated from mind because in a given body two minds cannot be produced together at the same time.

35. There is a right worldly (*laukika*) view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*).[661]

Right worldly view is the wisdom (*prajñā)* associated (*saṃprayukta*) with the good (*kuśala*) but impure (*sāsrava*) mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*).

36. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*śraddha*), etc., are both mundane (*laukika*) and supramundane (*lokottara*).[662]

37. There are two non-determinate (*avyākṛta*) dharmas.[663]

Like most of the sects of the Lesser Vehicle, the Sarvāstivādins accepted <144> the existence of non-determinate things, i. e., neither good (*kuśala*) nor bad (*akuśala*) and not bearing any fruit.

---

[658] Vasumitra, thesis 24; Bhavya, thesis 17, maintains the contrary. L. V. P.: Kośa, I, p. 58.
[659] Vasumitra, thesis 24,. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 39 and I, 19-20 and 60-61. T. S. 1545, pp. 64-66, 219b and 610a. K'ouei-Ki, III, p. 19b.
[660] Vasumitra, thesis 25. L. V. P.: Kośa, II, p. 177. T. S. 1545, pp. 270-271.
[661] Vasumitra, thesis 26. Bhavya, thesis 16. L, V. P.: Kośa, I, pp. 80-81.
[662] Vasumitra, thesis. 26. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 118-120. T. S. 1545, p. 7c. See thesis 189 of the TheravNMadins.
[663] Vasumitra, thesis 27. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, pp. 53 seq.; IV, pp. 31, 35, 104-6, etc. T. S. 1541 and 1542, passim.

38. The Arhants also have dharmas that do not belong either to those in training or to those beyond training (*naivaśaikṣanāśaikṣa*).[664]

These are impure (*sāsrava*) dharmas.

39. The Arhants attain the meditations (*dhyāna*) but do not attain them clearly.[665]

It is by means of the four fundamental absorptions (*maulasamāpatti*) that the Arhants rid themselves of the afflictions. As soon as they are on the Path of deliverance (*vimuktimārga*), they obtain the fundamental meditations. However, they cannot manifest them in a distinct way or examine them in depth and know to which class they belong exactly.

40. The Arhants receive the maturation (*vipāka*) of their earlier actions (*pūrvakarman*).[666]

The Arhants and even the Buddha continue to feel the effects of their earlier actions.

41. There are ordinary people (*pṛthagjana*) who die with a good (*kuśala*) mind (*citta*).[667]

42. One does not die while one is in meditation (*samādhi*).[668]

43. The deliverances (*vimukti*) of the Buddhas and their disciples are identical but their three Vehicles (*yāna*) each have distinctive characteristics.[669] The loving-kindness (*maitrī*), compassion (*karuṇā),* etc., of the Buddhas does not take beings (*sattva*) as object *(ālambana*).[670]

Since beings do not exist as individuals (*pudgala*) but as unstable groups of aggregates (*skandha*), the loving-kindness, compassion, etc., of the Buddhas cannot be directed at the beings themselves but at the series of impermanent aggregates wrongly designated as beings.

44. While they are attached to existence (*bhava*), beings (*sattva*) cannot obtain final deliverance (*vimukti*).[671]

It seems that this is a corollary to the rejection of personalism (*pudgalavāda*).

45. The Bodhisattvas are necessarily worldly (*pṛthagjana*) for their bonds (*saṃyojana*) have not yet been abandoned (*prahīṇa*). As long as they have not entered into the assurance of attainment (*samyaktvaniyāma*), they have not transcended (*samatikrāmanti*) the worldly level (*pṛthagjanabhūmi*).[672]

46. Beings (*sattva*) are merely the designation (*prajñapti*) of the series (*saṃtati*) of successive existences (*bhava*).[673]

47. All composites (*saṃskāra*) are destroyed each moment (*kṣāṇikaniruddha*).[674]

48. Nothing transmigrates (*saṃkrāmati*) from this world (*asmāllokāt*) to another world (*paraṃ lokaṃ).* To say that the individual (*pudgala*) transmigrates <145> is merely a manner of speech. As long as

---

664 Vasumitra, thesis 28. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, pp. 6-7 and 58;VII, pp. 24-25.
665 Vasumitra, thesis 28. L. V. P.:Kośa, VIII, pp. 166 seq. T. S. 1545, pp. 822c. Oyama, III, p. 20a.
666 Vasumitra, thesis 28. T. S. 1545, p. 655 ab. Oyama, III, p. 20 ab.
667 Vasumitra, thesis 29. Cf. L. V. P.: Kośa, II, pp. 133-136; III, p. 133. No proof is given.
668 Vasumitra, thesis 30. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, p. 132.
669 Vasumitra, thesis 31. T. S. 1545, pp. 162ac and 735 bc.
670 Vasumitra, thesis 31. T. S. 1539, pp. 543c-545b.
671 Vasumitra, thesis 31.
672 Vasumitra, thesis 32. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 206; III, pp.129-130. T. S. 1545, pp. 780 ac.
673 Vasumitra, thesis 33. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, chap. IX. T. S. 1539, pp. 537a-547c. Bhavya, thesis 1.
674 Vasumitra, thesis 34. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 4.

life lasts, the composites (*saṃskāra*) are joined together. When there is cessation without residue (*aśeṣanirodha*), the aggregates (*skandha*) stop being transformed (*pariṇamanti*).[675]

49) There are supramundane meditations (*dhyāna*).[676]

The four pure (*anāsrava*) fundamental meditations (*mauladhyāna*) are called supramundane.

50. Logical examination (*vitarka*) can be pure (*anāsrava*).[677]

Reasoning exists in the first pure *dhyāna*.

51. The good (*kuśala*) is cause of existence (*bhavahetu*).[678]

It is as a result of the maturation of good actions that one is reborn among the various gods.

52. In the state of meditation (*samādhi*), there is no vocal emission (*vacibheda*).[679]

53. The noble eightfold Path *(āryamārga aṣṭāngika*) is the wheel of the Dharma (*dharmacakra*). When the Tathāgatas speak, they do not always turn the wheel of Dharma.[680]

54. The Buddha can teach all dharmas by means of one single sound (*svara*).[681]

55. All the words of the Buddhas do not accord with the meaning (*yathārtha*).[682]

56. All the *Sūtra*s preached by the Buddhas do not have a completely explicit meaning (*nītārtha*). The Buddha himself said that there are *Sūtras* the meaning of which is not explicit.[683]

57. The Steam-enterer (*srotāpanna*) and the Once-returner (*sakṛdāgmamin*) do not obtain the meditations (*dhyāna*).[684]

In fact, they have not yet abandoned desire (*kāma*).

58. Meditative stabilization (*samādhi*) is the continuity of the mind (*cittasantati*).[685]

Meditative stability that can last for a very long time without being interrupted is defined as the continuity of mind during all time.

59. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*śraddha*), etc., are both impure (*sāsrava*) and pure (*anāsrava*).[686]

Supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) have the self nature (*svabhāva*) of the five faculties. But these supreme worldly dharmas occur in all beings (*sattva*). Consequently the five faculties also occur in all impure beings.

60. The nature (*bhāva*) of the five faculties (*indriya*) of faith, etc., is not exclusively good (*kuśala*).[687]

---

675 Vasumitra, thesis 35. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IX. T. S. 1539, pp. 537a-547c.
676 Vasumitra, thesis 36. L. V. P.: Kośa, VIII, pp. 146 seq. And 170-173.T. S. 1545, pp. 820-821. Oyama, III, p. 22a.
677 Vasumitra, thesis 37. L. V. P.: Kośa, VIII, p. 147.T. S. 1545, p. 219.
678 Vasumitra, thesis 37. Oyama, III, p. 22a. T. S. 1545, p. 820c.
679 Vasumitra, thesis 38.T. S. 1545, p. 929c. Oyama, III, p. 22ab. No proof is mentioned.
680 Vasumitra, thesis 39. T. S. 1545, p. 911b-913a. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI,pp. 245-249,
681 Vasumitra, thesis 40.
682 Vasumitra, thesis 40.
683 Vasumitra, thesis 40. L. V. P.: Kośa, III, p. 75; IX, p. 246. Bhavya, thesis 14 says the opposite.
684 T. S. 1545, p. 693bc, 719c. Bhavya, thesis 9, says the opposite.
685 *Kathāvatthu*, XI, 6.
686 T. S., 1545, p. 7c.

The five faculties are mixed with other dharmas and have the same support *(āśraya*), same action, same object *(ālambana*), same production (*utpāda*), <146> same duration (*sthiti*), same cessation (*nirodha*), same fruit (*phala*), same result (*niṣyanda*), same maturation (*vipāka*). These dharmas are not always good. Therefore the five faculties are not always good.

61. The supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) are included (*paryāpanna*) only in the form realm (*rūpadhātu*).[688]

They cannot be included in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) since in it one cannot definitively abandon the obstacles *(āvaraṇa*) and the bonds (*saṃyojana*). They are not included in the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*) for one must produce them before entering into the meditations of this realm.

62. The supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) last only a moment (*ekakṣaṃika*).[689]

63. The heresy of individualism (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*) has a real object *(ālambana*), namely, the five appropriating skandhas (*upādānaskandha*), which it takes as the self *(ātman*), that which belongs to the self *(ātmanya*), and that which is real.[690]

64. One single cognition (*jñāna*) cannot cognize all dharmas (*sravadharma*).[691]

It cannot cognize its own nature (*svabhāva*) for it cannot be both its own cause (*hetu*) and its own fruit (*phala*), its own agent (*kartṛ)* and its own effect (*kṛta*), perceiver and perceived, etc. It cannot cognize dharmas that are associated with it, for they have the same object *(ālambana*) and function at the same time. It cannot cognize things that are co-existent (*sahbhū*) with it, for their characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) are too close.

65. It is the knowledge (*jñāna*) that cognizes and not the individual (*pudgala*).[692]

Since the individual is merely a pure designation and not a reality, it cannot cognize.

66. Knowledge (*jñāna*) and consciousness (*vijñāna*) are both factors of existence (*bhāvaṇga*) and members of the Path (*mārgāṇga*).[693]

67. In a given individual (*pudgala*), two minds (*citta*) are not produced at the same time.[694]

On the one hand, an individual does not really exist. On the other hand, two things cannot be causes of one another mutually.

68. Knowledge (*jñāna*) and consciousness (*vijñāna*) are not produced at the same time.[695]

69. The two eyes together see forms (*rūpa*).[696]

Neither the visual consciousness (*cakṣurvijñāna*) nor the wisdom (*prajñā)* can see forms for they do not have the nature of seeing (*darśana*). Nor is it the complex (eye and visual consciousness) that sees forms,

---

[687] Ibid., p. 8b.
[688] Ibid., p. 14a seq.
[689] Ibid., p. 20b seq.
[690] Ibid., p. 36a.
[691]. Ibid., 42c seq.
[692] Ibid., p. 42c seq.
[693] Ibid, p. 44b.
[694] Ibid., p. 47b.
[695] Ibid. p. 44b.
[696] Ibid., p. 61c.

for then one would always be seeing, which is not the case as experience proves. If it was one eye that saw and not both together, there would not be simultaneous sensations.

70. Names (*nāma*), phrases, letters, etc., exist truly and consist (*saṃgṛhīta*) of the aggregate of mental formations (*saṃskāraskandha*) dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[697] <147>

71. Causes and conditions truly exist.[698]

72. Mind (*citta*) and mental factors (*caitta*) are produced simultaneously.[699]
Both depend on the same faculty (*indriya*) and objectively the same objective domain (*viṣaya*). Therefore they are produced simultaneously.

73. Ignorance (*avidyā)* and conceptual theories (*dṛṣṭi*) are or are not universal (*sarvatraga*) according to the case.[700]

74. Craving (*tṛṣṇā*), pride (*māna*) and mind (*citta*) are never universals (*sarvatrāga*).[701]

75. The five aggregates *(skandha*) can also be causes of retribution (*vipāka*) as well as fruits of maturation (*vipākaphala*).[702]

76. Form (*rūpa*), mind (*citta*), mental events (*caitta*) and composites dissociated from mind (*cittaviprayuktasaṃskāra*) can also be causes of maturation (*vipākahetu*) as well as fruits of maturation (*vipākahetu*).[703]

77. The cause of maturation (*vipākahetu*) the fruit of which has already ripened truly exists.[704]

78. Dharmas are neither produced nor cease without causes (*hetu*).[705]

79. The craving for non-existence (*vibhavatṛṣṇā)* must be abandoned (*prahātvya*) only by meditation (*bhāvanā*).[706]

80. The nature (*bhāva*) of the mind (*citta*) is not fundamentally pure (*prabhāsvara*). It is the mind cleared of lust (*kāma*), of hatred (*dveṣa*) and of ignorance (*avidyā)* that is delivered (*vimukta*).[707]
The afflictions (*kleśa*) the nature of which is fundamentally afflicted (*kliṣṭa*) and which are associated (*saṃprayukta*) with the mind, are impure. It is not the afflictions that defile the mind for they have the same nature as the latter and, as they are impure, the latter is also impure. Furthermore, it must be accepted that the mind was pure before being defiled. In this case, how can one maintain that the future mind is fundamentally pure? On the other hand, as long as lust, hatred and ignorance have not been abandoned, the mind cannot be delivered.

81. The three cessations (*nirodha*) truly exist.[708]

---

[697] Ibid., p. 70a.
[698] Ibid., p. 79a, 680c.
[699] Ibid., p. 79c.
[700] Ibid., p. 90c.
[701] Ibid., p. 90c
[702] Ibid., pp 96a, 263c.
[703] Ibid. p. 96a.
[704] Ibid., pp. 90b, 263c.
[705] Ibid., p. 103c.
[706] Ibid., p. 138b. Very lengthy discussion based on the interpretation of a *Sūtra*.
[707] Ibid., p. 149bc seq.
[708] Ibid., p. 161a. See thesis 86.

82. The cessation due to impermanence (*anityanirodha*) is composite (*saṃskṛta*).

This is a characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*) of composites and as a result it is composite like them.

83. Extinction (*nirvāṇa*) is defined as not concerning either those in training or those beyond training (*naivaśaikṣanāśaikṣa*).[709]

Extinction is not a fruit (*phala*) that can be cultivated like the Path (*mārga*) or the composite Fruits (*saṃskṛta*) of those in training (*śaikṣa*) and those beyond training (*aśaikṣa*).

84. Dream truly exists.[710] <148>

85) The affictions (*kleśa*) are either bad *(akuśala*) or indeterminate (*avyākṛta*).[711]

Because they produce undesirable fruits (*phala*), they are called bad. Craving (*tṛṣṇā)* and ignorance (*avidyā)* can be indeterminate.

86. The characteristics of the composites (*saṃskṛtalakṣaṇa*) truly exist.[712]

87. The characteristics of the composites (*saṃskṛtalakṣaṇa*) are exclusively composite (*saṃskṛta*).[713]

88. One single instant (*kṣaṇa*) has the three characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of production (*utpāda*), decline (*vyaya*) and cessation (*nirodha*).[714]

The moments of action are different: at the moment when a thing is produced, production becomes active; at the moment when a thing ceases, decline and cessation become active. Although the substance exists only in a given moment, activity has a before and an afterwards.

89. Intention (*cetanā)* and mental speech (*manojalpa*) are mental event (*caitta*) dharmas having distinct self nature (*svabhāva*).[715]

Intention is an action (*karman*): it is mental action (*manokarman*). Mental speech is wisdom (*prajñā*).

90. Conceptual analysis (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) are mental (*caitta*) dharmas.[716]

91. All knowledges (*jñāna*) objectify an objective domain (*viṣaya*).[717]

92. The body of birth (*janmakāya*) of the Buddha is impure (*sāsrava*).[718]

If the body of birth of the Buddha were pure (*anāsrava*), it would not have caused desire to arise in a woman, hatred in Aṇgulimāla, pride in Mānaśrabdha, ignorance in Uruvilvā Kāśyapa.

93. The nature (*bhāva*) of worldly people (*pṛthagjana*) is included (*paryāpanna*) in the three realms (*dhātu*). It must be abandoned (*prahātavya*) by meditation (*bhāvanā).* It is not afflicted (*kliṣṭa*). It

---

[709] Ibid., p. 169a.
[710] Ibid., p. 193b This thesis depends on a group of *Sūtra*s.
[711] Ibid., pp. 196a, 250c.
[712] Ibid., p. 198a.
[713] Ibid., p. 198a.
[714] Ibid., p. 200a.
[715] Ibid., p. 216b.
[716] Ibid., p. 218c.
[717] Ibid., p. 228b.
[718] Ibid., pp. 229a, 392a.

consists of the aggregate of mental composites (*saṃskāraskandha*) dissociated from mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[719]

94. The self nature (*svabhāva*) of worldly people (*pṛthagjana*) truly exists.[720]

95. Conceptual analysis (*vitarka*) and reflection are in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) and in the first dhyāna. Analysis alone without concept is in the intermediate dhyāna (*dhyānāntara*). There is absence of conceptual analysis and reflection in the three higher dhyānas and in the four formless *(ārūpya*) absorptions.[721]

96. Dharmas are produced together and not necessarily one after another.[722]

Each arises as a result of its own characteristic of production (*svotpādalakṣaṇa*).

97. The two bonds (*saṃyojana*) of envy (*īrṣyā)* and egotism (*matsara*) exist only in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*).[723] <149>

98) The nature of the conditions (*pratyayatā)* truly exists.[724]

If the nature of the conditions did not exist, no dharma could truly exist, for the four kinds of conditions include everything.

99. The bonds (*saṃyojana*) and things subject to appropriation (*saṃyojanīya*) truly exist, but the individual (*pudgala*) does not exist.[725]

100. All dharmas are understood in their own nature (*svabhāva*); this is comprehension in the absolute meaning (*paramārtha*).[726]

If comprehension in the nature of another (*parabhāva*) were in the absolute sense, the self nature of one thing would be that of everything. In that case, when one thing were produced, all things would be produced, and when one thing were to cease, everything would cease, which is not the case.

101. It is only the afflicted (*kliṣṭa*) mind (*citta*) that can ensure the continuity of things (*bhavasantati*).[727]

When a male being enters into its mother's womb, it produces a mind of love towards its mother and a mind of hatred towards its father. When a female being enters into her mother's womb, it produces a mind of love towards its father and a mind of hatred towards its mother. When a Bodhisattva enters into the mother's womb, he produces a mind of love instinctively towards both mother and father. But, as it is a mind of love [therefore endowed with passion], his mind is defiled. Consequently, in every case, it is the defiled mind that ensures the continuity of existence.

102. All the afflictions (*kleśa*) ensure the continuity of existence (*bhavasantati*).[728]

---

[719] Ibid., p. 231b.
[720]
[721] Ibid., p. 269c, 462c.
[722] Ibid., pp. 270a, 463a, 493c.
[723] Ibid., p. 271b.
[724] Ibid. p. 283b.
[725] Ibid., p. 288b.
[726] Ibid., pp 306c, 550a.
[727] Ibid., 309a.
[728] Ibid., 309a.

It is not just love and hate, but all the afflictions that ensure the continuity of existence.

103. The four fruits of the religious life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*) are both composite (*saṃskṛta*) as well as non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*).[729]

104. The person who conquers the afflictions (*kleśa*) is not reborn in the higher realms.[730]

In order to abandon the lower realms and be reborn in the higher realms, it is necessary to exhaust the afflictions.

105. Some form (*rūpa*) is included (*saṃgṛhīta*) in the domain of mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*), namely, non-information (*avijñapti*).[731]

106. Vocal sounds (*śabda*) truly exist. Images reflected in water or in a mirror truly exist.[732]

Both have multiple causes producing them. The sounds are produced by reason of the lips, teeth, tongue, palate, trachea, etc., which are struck and from which the sounds emanate. The images are produced by reason of the light of the sun or the moon and of jewels, vases, water, etc., on which they are reflected. Being products due to causes, sounds and images truly exist. <150>

107. There is no distinction between the nature of time (*kala*) and that of the composites (*saṃskāra*).[733]

Time is the composites and the composites are time. Time is that, the increase of which reveals the composites.

108. There is no form (*rūpa*) in the formless realm *(ārūpydhātu*).[734]

109. The mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) has objects similar to or different from those of the five sense consciousnesses. It also has as objects the internal (*adhyātmika*) faculties (*indriya*) and the other consciousnesses (*vijñāna*).[735]

110. The mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) evolve together and can act mutually as immediately preceding conditions (*samanantarapratyaya*).[736]

Only the mind and mental events are immediately preceding conditions, because other things do not produce effects that are the same as their causes.

111. The 'obtainments' (*prapti*) and 'non-obtainments' (*aprapti*) truly exist.[737]

112. The Path (*mārga*) is composite (*saṃskṛta*).[738]

One practices the Path, but one cannot practice the non-composite. Therefore the Path is composite.

113. Pure (*anāsrava*) patience (*kṣānti*) is seeing (*darśana*) and not knowledge (*jñāna*).[739]

---

729 Ibid., p. 337a seq.
730 Ibid., p. 355a.
731 Ibid., p.383b.
732 Ibid., p. 390c.
733 Ibid., pp. 393a, 700a.
734 Ibid., p. 431b seq. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VIII, pp. 135-141.
735 Ibid., p. 449a
736 Ibid., p. 461b. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 300.
737 Ibid., pp. 479b, 550c-562a.
738 Ibid., p. 479c.
739 Ibid., p. 489b. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VII, p. 2.

It is not knowledge for, when it is produced, uncertainty (*vicikitsā)* is not abandoned, whereas knowledge is produced only when uncertainty has been abandoned. By nature it is analysis, thus vision.

114. Good (*kuśala*) impure (*sāsrava*) wisdom associated (*saṃprayukta*) with the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) is seeing (*darśana*).[740]

It is part of ordinary (*saṃvṛti*) right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*).

115. Errors (*viparyāsa*) are of four kinds only and can be abandoned only by seeing (*darśana*).[741]

116. In one given mind (*ekacitta*), there are both knowledge (*jñāna*) and ignorance (*ajñāna),* or absence of knowledge (*na jñāna*) and absence of ignorance (*nājñāna*), or uncertainty (*vicikitsā)* and certainty (*niyāma*), or absence of uncertainty (*na vivikitsā)* and absence of certainty (*na niyāma*), or coarseness (*sthūlatā)* and subtlety (*sūkṣmatā),* or absence of coarseness (*na sthūlatā)* and absence of subtlety (*nā sūkṣmatā*).[742]

117. Outside of intention (*cetanā),* the self natures (*svabhāva*) of physical actions (*kāyakarman*) and vocal actions (*vākkarman*) exist distinctly.[743]

118. Aspiration (*abhidhyā),* maliciousness (*vyāpāda*) and wrong view (*mithyādṛṣṭi*) do not have the self nature (*svabhāva*) of action (*karman*),[744]

119. All actions cannot be reversed.[745] <151>

There are actions that cannot be redeemed by means of good actions, such as the unpardonable acts *(ānantaryakarman*).

120. Right livelihood (*samyagājīva*) and wrong livelihood (*mithyājīva*) have vocal action (*vākkarman*) and physical action (*kāyakarman*) as their nature.[746]

Physical and vocal actions, according to whether they are bad or good, produced or not produced by the passions, make up wrong livelihood or right livelihood.

121. Sound (*śabda*) is not fruit of maturation (*vipākaphala*).[747]

Sound is not fruit of maturation , "for the voice proceeds from a desire for action."

122. When an act has not yet been freed of afflictions (*kleśa*), its maturation is not freed of afflictions either.[748]

In this case, their maturation can be abandoned (*prahātvya*) only by meditation (*bhāvanā).*

123) Objects created by magic (*nirmāṇavastu*) truly exist.[749]

This more precisely is a question of the magical bodies which the meditator can produce in other cosmic levels than the one which he inhabits.

---

[740] Ibid., p. 5012ab. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 23 seq.
[741] Ibid., p. 536c. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 23 seq.
[742] Ibid., p. 547b.
[743] Ibid., p. 587a. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 136.
[744] Ibid., p. 587a. L. V. P., *Kośa*, IV, p. 136.
[745] Ibid., pp. 593b, 359b.
[746] Ibid., p. 604c. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 189.
[747] Ibid., p. 612c. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, pp. 68-70.
[748] Ibid, 629a.
[749] Ibid., 696bc.

124. Contact (*sparśa*) truly exists.[750]

If contact did not exist, a link would be missing in the chain of dependent origination (*pratītyāsamutpada*), and feeling (*vedanā)* could not be produced.

125. Life *(āyus*) is not consecutive to the mind (*cittānuparivartin*).[751]

Dharmas that are consecutive to the mind necessarily have the same production (*ekotpāda*), same duration (*ekasthiti*) and same cessation (*ekanirodha*) as the mind. But this is not the case for the life.

126. There is premature death (*akālamaraṇa*).[752]

There can be premature death among the beings of *kāmadhātu* who are not in the two higher absorptions. For them, life *(āyus*) is dependent on the vital series (*saṃtānavartin*) and consequently, when the body is harmed, the life is harmed. On the other hand, for beings of *rūpadhātu* and *ārūpyadhātu* and those of *kāmadhātu* who are in the two higher absorptions, the life is such that once they are born, life lasts. In this case, the body cannot be harmed nor can the life be harmed either. Besides, they do not die when they are in meditation.

127. There is no mind (*citta*) in the absorption without perception (*asaṃjñāsamāpatti*).[753]

128. In the absorption of cessation of perception and sensation (*saṃjñāvedayitanirodha*), all minds have ceased (*niruddha*).[754]

129. All the meditations (*dhyāna*) have members (*aṇga*).[755]

130. One enters into the assurance of eventual attainment of enliughtenment (*samyakyvaniyāma*) by meditating on the three kinds of suffering (*duḥkha*), namely, the suffering of <152> suffering (*duḥkhaduḥkhatā),* the suffering of the composites (*saṃskāraduḥkhatā)* and the suffering of change (*parināmaduḥkhatā).*[756]

131. The group (*rāśi*) of beings (*sattva*) established in falsehood (*mithyatvaniyāta*) appear only in the realm of desire (*kāmadhātu*). The group of beings established in assurance (*saṃyaktvaniyata*) and that of beings not established (*aniyata*) appear in the three realms.[757]

132. All the bonds (*saṃyojana*) are bad (*akuśala*) in the three realms (*dhātu*).[758]

The Sarvāstivādins hold to the formal teaching of the Buddha.

133. There is no Arhant 'with the same head' (*samaśirsin*).[759]

134. There are ten emptinesses (*śūnyatā):* inner (*adhyātma*) e., outer (*bahirdā)* e.*,* inner-outer (*adhyātmabahirdhā*) e., composite (*saṃskṛta*) e., non-composite (*saṃskṛta*) e., e. without beginning or end

---

[750] Ibid., 760b.
[751] Ibid., p. 770c.
[752] Ibid., 771a. L. V. P: *Kośa*, II, p. 218.
[753] Ibid., pp. 772c, 774a. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 200.
[754] Ibid., p. 775a. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 203.
[755] Ibid., p. 814a. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VIII, pp. 132-133 and 147-161.
[756] Ibid., p. 928a. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, p 125.
[757] Ibid., p. 930b. L. V. P.: Kośa, III, pp. 137-138.
[758] Ibid., p. 260abc.
[759] Ibid., p. 929bc.

(*anavarāgra*), natural (*prakṛti*) e., non-dispersed (*anavakāra*) e., e. in the absolute sense (*paramārtha*) and e. of emptiness (*śūnyatā*).[760]

135. The atoms (*paramānu*) are only points without extension and they do not touch.[761]

136. The atoms, taken individually (*pratyekaṃ)* when they are agglomerated (*saṃghaṭita*), are the object condition *(ālambanapratyaya*) of the consciousness (*vijñāna*).[762]

137. In name and form (*nāmarūpa*) there is a consciousness (*vijñāna*) that is maturation (*vipāka*), consequently indeterminate (*avyākṛta*) and produced by the mental formations (*saṃskāra*), for the latter exist although they are past.[763]

138. The absence of harming (*avihiṃsa*) is not the absence of hatred (*adveṣa*), but rather it possesses a separate nature, namely kindness.[764]

139. The four characteristics (*lakṣhaṇa*) are attributed to the moment (*kṣaṇa*).[765]

140. The substance of information by means of the body (*kāyavijñaptirūpa*) is shape (*saṃsthāna*).[766] <153>

[760] Ibid., pp. 37a and 540a.T. S. 1656, pp. 27a and 347a.
[761] Ibid., L. V. P.*: Siddhi*, p. 39. *Kośa*, I, pp. 89-92.
[762] Ibid., L. V. P.: Siddhi, p. 44.
[763] Ibid., p. 218.
[764] Ibid., pp. 335-336.
[765] Ibid., p. 67.
[766] Ibid., p. 48.

CHAPTER XXI

The Mūlasarvāstivādins.

Their name is unknown to all the early lists (the Ceylonese lists, *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra*, Vasumitra, *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchāsūtra*, the three traditions cited by Bhavya), i.e., all the lists comprising two major trunks and the single list comprising three trunks. All these lists are prior to the 7th cntury C.E. In the first half even of this 7th century, Hiuan-tsang makes no mention of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. It was I-tsing who, at least a half-century later, was the first to speak of them, making of them one of the four fundamental sects having as subdivisions the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the Dharmaguptakas, the Mahīśāsakas and the Kāśyapīyas.[767] But he mentions also the Sarvāstivādins in such a way that there seems to be no difference between the latter and the Mūlasarvāstivādins.[768] If Vinītadeva, somewhat after I-tsing, and later the authors of the *Bhikṣuvarṣāgrapṛcchāsūtra* who adopted the same classification of three trunks, call one of these trunks that of the Sarvstivādins and not that of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the latter, excluding the former, appear among the sects coming from this trunk.

Only the Vinayapiṭaka of this sect has come down to us. It is clearly distinct from that of the Sarvāstivādins, which also has come down to us. The Chinese translation of this vast work,[769] made according to copies brought from India, was carried out by I-tsing. The sole *Vinayapiṭaka* possessed by the Tibetans is also that of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, which was translated into Tibetan by Jinamitra under the reign of Ralpachan, at the beginning of the 9th century C.E.[770]

The latter proves that, at that time and undoubtedly during the previous century, in the part of India bordering on Tibet with which the latter was in direct relationship, i.e., Kashmir and the Ganges basin, the Mūlasarvāstivādin sect was definitely predominant. I-tsing had already noticed this fact in the last quarter of the 7th century. According to him, the Mūlasarvāstivādins were the most numerous in Magadha, i.e., in the middle Ganges basin. Some were found in the west at Lāta and Sindhu, and in the south. They were well represented in the east (Bengal) but they were the only Buddhists in the north (north of the Punjab and in Kashmir), which for a long time had been the main stronghold of the Sarvāstivādins.[771] They constituted almost all of the Buddhists in the Sonde islands and some were found in Champa.[772]

---

[767] Takausu, *A record of the Buddhist religion*, pp. XXIV, 7, 8, 20, etc.
[768] Ibid, pp. 9, 76, 140.
[769] T. S. 1442 to 1459. In all, 200 k'iuan.
[770] Ch. Elioy: Hinduism and Buddhism, vol. III, p. 379 and 351. In all 7 works in 13 volumes.
[771] Takakusu, A record of the Buddhist religion, pp. XXIV, 8, 9.
[772] Ibid., pp. 10 and 12.

The literary language used by the Mūlasarvāstivādins was Sanskrit, a purer <154> Sanskrit than that used by the Sarvāstivādins, which would indicate that the works of the Mūlasarvāstivādins belonged to a later period than those of the Sarvāstivādins.[773]

However, despite in-depth but very partial studies, the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins seems entirely more archaic than that of the Sarvāstivādins and even most of the other *Vinayapiṭakas*.[774] Moreover, Huber and Sylvain Lévi, followed by Przyluski, have recognized in this *Vinayapiṭaka* the source from which most of the stories of the *Divyāvadāna* have been taken.[775] To appreciate these facts, we must remember that, although the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins was translated into Chinese in the first years of the 8th century by I-tsing, that of the Sarvāstivādins had been translated by Kumārajīva at the beginning of the 5th century, 300 years earlier. Therefore it must have been in the 4th century at the latest and undoubtedly even earlier that the two *Vinayapiṭakas* had existed together. But it is rather improbable and even impossible that one single sect would have possessed simultaneously two different *Vinayapiṭakas*. As no trace of the name of the Mūlasarvāstivādins has been found before the end of the 7th century, it follows that from the 4th century, two different sects claimed the name of Sarvāstivādin and possessed, if not perhaps two absolutely different Canons, at least two different *Vinayapiṭakas*. What we know about the history of the Sarvāstivādins and about their tendencies to split into distinct more or less rival schools,[776] allows us to assume that this was indeed the case.

Only Vinitadeva, who does not consider the Sarvāstivādins as a distinct sect but as a group of sects, gives us information about the doctrine of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. This is not essentially different from that of the Sarvāstivādins: Here are the theses:

1. All composites are included (*saṃgṛhīta*) in the three times, name (*nāman*) and form (*rūpa*).[777]

2. Those that do not belong to the sixth [the realm of mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*)], and the non-composites (*saṃskṛta*) are cognizable and perceivable by the consciousness (*vijñeya*).[778]

3. There are three kinds of non-composites (*asaṃskṛta*).[779]

4. The afflictions (*kleśa*) are provided with sameness.[780]

5. The Munis are of two kinds. In them, the sermons (*pravacana*) and the faculties (*indriya*) are very slightly form (*rūpin*).[781]

6. The worship (*pūjā)* of a shrine (*caitya*) produces great fruit (*mahāphala*).[782]

---

[773] Lin Li Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, pp. 198-201 and 221-222.
[774] Przyluki: *Légende d'Aśoka*, pp. 23, 68-69. etc; Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśalī*, pp. 233-241, etc.
[775] Przyluski: Op. cit,,p. V-VI, IX, 14, etc.
[776] See preceding chapter.
[777] Vinītadeva, thesis 1.See thesis 2 of the Sarvāstivādons.
[778] Ibid., thesis 2. See thesis 3 of the Sarvāstivādins, which seems to contradict this, but the negation appears to be faulty.
[779] Ibid., thesis 3. See thesis 6 of the Sarvāstivādins.
[780] Ibid., thesis 4. The meaning of this thesis remains enigmatical.
[781] Ibid., thesis 5.
[782] Ibid., thesis 6.

7. It is said that there is a desire (*icchā)* of two kinds in regard to the abandonment (*prahāna*) of the bad destinies (*durgati*) by the Bodhisattvas.[783]

8. Merit (*puṇya*) accomplishes the accumulation of the Path (*mārga*).[784] <155>

[783] Ibid., thesis 7.
[784] Ibid., thesis 8.

CHAPTER XXII

The Sautrāntikas or Saṇkrāntivādins

All the sources agree in considering them to be a sect lately derived from the Sarvāstivādins. The sources of the north-west make it the last-appearing of the classical sects and place its origin in the 4th century C.E.

The *Śāriputraparipṛcchāsūtra* distinguishes the Sautrāntikas from the Saṃkrāntivādins as it distinguishes the Kāśyapīyas from the Suvarṣakas. But all the other sources identify them.

According to Paramārtha, they taught that the five aggregates (*skanadha*) transmigrate (*saṇkrānti*) from one existence to another, hence their name Saṃkrāntika, and cease only when one cultivates the Path. As they recognize only the authority of the *Sūtrapiṭaka*, they are also called Sautrāntika.[785]

The various versions used by the translators of Vasumitra's treatise give more information. According to the version by Hiuan-tasng, they venerated Ānanda as their teacher. According to the version of the Ts'in, their founder was called Uttara. According to the Tibetan version, they were called Uttarīya becase they were higher (*uttara*) as regards the Dharma.

Bhavya (1st and 3rd list) confirms that the Saṇkrāntivādins were also called Uttarīya from the name of their founder Uttara, a dissident teacher of the Sarvāstivādins.

Tāranātha affirms that the Saṃkrāntivādins, the Uttarīyas and the Tāmraśatīyas were one and the same school.[786]

La Vallée Poussin has shown that the Darṣṭāntikas denounced often as heretics in the *Vibhāṣā* are probably the Sautrāntikas.[787]

K'ouei-ki summarizes the traditions cited by Paramārtha and adds some information on the origin of the sect. A teacher named Pūrṇa developed the Abhidharma and the Vinaya especially. He followed a reaction among some monks who seceded by taking Ānanda, the great Sūtra master, as patron saint.[788]

We know nothing of their domain, except that Hiuan-tsang encountered Śrughna, near Sthāneśvara, a teacher who taught him the Sautrāntika doctrine.[789]

We know nothing more of their literature.

Vasumitra says that the Sautrāntika doctrine is very close to that of the Sarvāstivādins.
Here are the theses attributed to them: <156>

---

[785] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 23 and 63.
[786] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 273.
[787] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, pp. LII-LV.
[788] K'ouei-ki,II, pp. 9b-10a.
[789] Watters: *Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, p. 321.

1. The five aggregates (*skandha*) transmigrate (*saṃkrānti*) from one lifetime to the next.[790]

2. Outside of the Path (*mārga*), there is no definitive cessation (*nirodha*) of the aggregates (*skandha*).[791]

This is a corollary of the preceding thesis.

3. The individual (*pudgala*) does not exist in the absolute sense (*paramārtha*).[792]

Although Vasumitra states the contrary, here it is Bhavya who must be correct. In fact, the *pudgalavādin* doctrine is well known, but it is always attributed to the Vātsīputrīyas and to the Sammatīyas and never to the Sautrāntikas. However, the latter are well known to the Sarvāstivādins. If they had effectively maintained this opinion as Vasumitra has it, Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra on the one hand, the *Vibhāṣā* on the other hand, would not have failed to make it known to us in the long passages in their works where they denounce the *pudgalavāda* by attributing it formally to the Vātsīputrīyas, as do also the *Kathāvatthu* and the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*.[793] On the other hand, this thesis would needlessly strengthen the first one, which is enough to explain continuity in the mechanism of retribution of actions. K'ouei-ki comments on this passage of Vasumitra by distinguishing this thesis from that of the Sammatīyas, etc., which maintains that the *pudgala* is neither identical with nor different from the skandhas.[794]

4. The aggregates (*skandha*) have a root and an end (*mūlānta*). The aggregates are of one taste (*ekarasa*) only.[795]

According to K'ouei-ki, a subtle (*sūkṣma*) persistent mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) assures the continuity of the aggregates, constitutes their root and their end and gives them this single taste. [796]

5. In the state of the worldly person (*pṛthagjana*), there are noble dharmas *(āryadharma*) as well.[797]

6. The four aggregates (*skandh*a) are fixed in their self nature (*svabhāva*).[798]

Lacking a commentary, the meaning of this proposition remains unknown. Perhaps it should be compared with the 44th above, the four aggregates being determined by the fifth, the aggregate of consciousness (*vijñānaskandha*) which, being identical with the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*), would make up their self nature.

7. The aggregates are provided with fundamental sins (*mūlāpatti*).[799]

---

[790] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 1; Vinītadeva, thesis 1.
[791] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 3.
[792] Bhavya, thesis 4; Vasumitra, thesis 5, says the opposite, similarly Vinītadeva, thesis 1 of the Vibhajyavādins, which immediately follows the Saṇkrāntivādins.
[793] L.V. P.: *Kośa*, chap. IX. Saṃghabhadra: T. S. 1562 and 1563, chap. IX; *Vibhāṣā:* T. S. 1545, pp. 288b, 42ab, 110b; *Kathāvatthu*, I, 1; *Satyasiddhiśāstra*: T. S. 1646, [. 259a; *Vibhāṣā:* T. S. 1545, p. 288b attributes to the Darṣṭāntikas the thesis according to which the *pudgala* is fictive.
[794] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 48ab.
[795] Vasumitra, thesis 3.
[796] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 47ab. Cf also L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, pp. LIII, LIV.
[797] Vasumitra, thesis 4.
[798] Vinītadeva, thesis 2.
[799] Bhavya, thesis 3.

Lacking a commentary, it is impossible to discover the true meaning of this thesis. According to the *Abhidharmakośaśāstra*, the fundamental sins (*maulāpatti*) are those causing the monk to be stripped of his quality of monkhood, i.e., incontinence, major theft, killing a human and lying about supernatural powers.[800] Does this mean that as long as the aggregates have not been definitively destroyed, one is exposed to the committing of these sins? <157>

8. Everything (*sarva*) is impermanent (*anitya*).[801]

This confirms thesis 3 above.

9. The non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*) does not truly exist.[802]

The non-composites are not real and distinct entities but rather pure absences. Space is the absence of the tangible (*spraṣṭavya*). The *pratisaṃkhyānirodha* or *nirvāṇa* is the absence of latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) and of existence (*bhava*) obtained by the help of wisdom (*prajñā*). The *apratisaṃkhyānirodha* is the absence of the arising of future things obtained by the absence of causes and independently from the power of wisdom.

10. Past (*atīta*) and future (*anāgata*) dharmas do not truly exist.[803]

If they really existed, the composites (*saṃskṛta*) would always exist and would therefore be eternal, which is not so.

11. The obtainments (*prāpti*) do not really exist.[804]

They are not perceived either directly or by their effects. The two theories by which the Sarvāstivādins explain the mechanism of the retribution of actions are thus refuted.

12. The mechanism of the retribution of action is explained by the theory of seeds *(bīja*).[805]

The seed is the group of the five aggregates (*skandha*) capable of producing a fruit either immediately or after a certain time, thanks to the series: "Series (*saṃtati*) is the *saṃskāras* of the past, the present and the future in causal relation that constitute an uninterrupted series. *Pariṇāma*, or evolution of the series, is the modification (*anyathātva*) of the series, the fact that the series arises different from itself at each moment. *Viśeṣa*, or culminating term of this evolution, is the moment of the series that possesses the capability of producing the fruit immediately."

13. There are only four characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of composites (*saṃskṛta*), duration being the same as modification (*stityanyathātva*).[806]

The Sūtra to which they refer mentions only three characteristics, [807] as Vasubandhu found.

14. The without-obtainment (*aviprapti*) does not exist truly.[808]

---

[800] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 95 and n. 2.
[801] Bhavya, thesis 5.
[802] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, pp. 278-287.
[803] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 49-50.
[804] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 181 seq.
[805] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 183-185.
[806] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 223-224.
[807] T. S. 99, p. 83c. *Anguttaranikāya*, III, 47; P. T. S., I, p. 152; *Kathāvatthu*. I, 1.
[808] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 14.

Actually, *avijñapt*i "consists only of not doing an action by reason of [past great elements ..., now past dharmas no longer exist; *avijñapti* does not have the nature of *rūpa* ...", for it is not susceptible of colliding" (*apratigha*).

15. The vital faculty (*jīvitendriya*) does not exist truly.[809]

"This is a certain power that the action of a previous lifetime places in the being at the moment of conception, a power by which, during a determined length of time, the *skandhas* are renewed in this homogeneous series that makes up an existence (*nikāyasabhāga*)."

16. Physical action (*kāyakarman*) does not exist truly.[810] <158>

"Physical action is action having as its object the body... : i.e., the intention (*cetanā)* which puts the body into action ... in various ways: it proceeds by depending on this gate which is the body, and is therefore called physical action."

17. The eye (*cakṣus*) does not see forms (*rūpa*).[811]

"There is no organ that sees, nor visible thing which is seen; there is no action of seeing, no agent who sees; it is merely a play of causes and effects."

18. The mind (*citta*) and the body (*kāya*) endowed with its organs (*indriya*) are mutually seeds (*bīja*).[812]

"When an individual is born in Ārūpyadhātu, *rūpa*, or form, is cut off for a long period of time: if this individual then is reborn in Kāmadhātu or Rūpadhātu, his new *rūpa* does not come from the series of *rūpa* interrupted long ago, but from the mind. In the same way, the mind of coming out of absorption does not have as its cause the mind prior to the absorption: it arises from the 'body endowed with organs' (*sendriyakāya*)."

19. There is no simultaneous cause (*sahabhūhetu*).[813]

The cause-effect relationship is observed only in the cases where the cause is prior to the effect, never when it is simultaneous with the effect.

20. Non-composites (*asaṃskṛta*) are not causes (*hetu*).[814]

Indeed, the Sūtras teach that causes (*hetu*) and conditions (*pratyaya*) are impermanent (*anitya*) and consequently composite (*saṃskṛta*).

21. The omniscience (*sarvajñā*) of the Buddha is practiced by direct seeing (*sākṣātkāra*) of every thing, including things of the past and the future, and not by deduction or divination.[815]

22. Among formless beings (*arūpin*), the mental series of the mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) has no support external to it.[816]

---

[809] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 215-217.
[810] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 12.
[811] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 86.
[812] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 12. *Siddh*i, pp. 183 and 207: the aggregates (*skandha*) are perfumable (*vāsya*) and carry the seeds (*bīja*).
[813] L. V. P.*: Kośa*, II, p. 253.
[814] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 77-287.
[815] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 304-305.
[816] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, p. 6.

The mind and the mental events depend one upon the other. The mental series of a new existence is 'projected' by a cause, and if that is without attachment to matter, the mental series will be reborn and will exist unrelated to matter.

23. Shape (*saṃsthāna*) is not a distinct thing in and of itself (*anyad dravyaṃ)* but merely a designation (*prajnãpti*).[817]

If shape were a thing in itself, it would be perceived by two organs. Now shape is a part of form (*rūpa*) which is defined as the special object of the eye. Since we see many shapes in a complex shape, there would therefore be several forms (*rūpa*) in one and the same place, which is impossible. There are no atoms of shape.

24. Volition (*cetanā)* is not a mental act (*manaskarman*).[818]

There is no mental action apart from greed (*abhidhyā),* malevolence (*vyāpāda*) and wrong view (*mithyādṛṣṭi*).

25. The atom is extended; it involves spatial division (*digbhāgabheda*, *digvibhāga*). The atoms touch one another and collide as a result of their extension (*digdeśabheda-pratighāta*).[819] <159>

26. The object condition *(ālambanapratyaya*) is the agglomerated (*saṃghāṭita*) atoms (*paramāṇu*).[820]

When the visual consciousness (*cakṣurvijñāna*) cognizes color (*varṇa*), it does not reach the atoms but just their agglomeration since it takes the aspect of this agglomeration (*tadākātvāt*): we see a mass of blue not the atoms of blue.

27. The four characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) are attributed to the moment (*kṣaṇa*) and to a given prolonged state.[821]

28. The six actively functioning consciousnesses (*pravṛttivijñāna*) are seeds (*bīja*).[822]

29. The mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*), in the subtle (*sūkṣma*) state, subsists in the absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*).[823]

30. The five sense consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) do not have a simultaneous (*sahabhū*) support *(āśraya*). It is an earlier moment of the sensory organ (*indriya*) that gives rise to the subsequent consciousness. It is the same for the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*).[824]

31. Among the non-perceiving gods (*asaṃjñideva*), there is no belief in an actual self *(ātmagrāha*), but the seeds (*bīja*) of belief in a self remain in the state of non-perception. Therefore this state does involve belief in a self.[825]

---

[817] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, pp. 8-11.
[818] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, pp. 169-170 and 136.
[819] L. V. P.: *Siddhi*, p. 39.
[820] Ibid., p. 43.
[821] Ibid., p. 67.
[822] Ibid., p. 117.
[823] Ibid., pp. 142, 212-213, and 211. The opposite is said on p. 207, probably in error (Cf. thesis 18 and 22 aove).
[824] Ibid., p. 282.
[825] Ibid., p. 284.

32. Meditative stabilization (*samādhi*) is not a thing apart but the minds that have a single object (*cittāny evaikālamabāni*), for the Sūtra says that, of the three trainings (*śikṣā),* the teaching of the higher mind (*adhicittaṃ śikṣā)* is the concentration of the mind (*cittaikāgratā).*[826] <160>

[826] Ibid., p. 313; *Kośa*, VIII, p. 129.

CHAPTER XXIII

The Dārṣṭāntikas

Although the Dārṣṭāntikas seem to be identical with the Sautrāntikas, as La Vallée Poussin comments[827] and as is confirmed Tāranātha,[828] it is perhaps more cautious to treat them separately. In fact, Vasubandhu and the *Vibhāṣā* clearly distinguished the Dārṣṭāntikas from the Sautrāntikas. It is therefore quite possible that the Dārṣṭāntikas had been one of the schools, and even the main one, of the Sautrāntikas, but that there was a difference, although slight, between them.

The Dārṣṭāntikas owe their name to their frequent usage of comparisons (*dṛṣṭānta*) as the few fragments of their literature that have come down to us show.

Here are the theses attributed to them:

1. Matter (*rūpa*) is not homogeneous cause (*sabhāgahetu*) of matter.[829]

2) The form (*rūpa*) of the Arhant and external (*bāhya*) form, i.e., the five sense objects, are pure (*anāsrava*) because they are not the support *(āśraya*) of the impurities *(āsrava*).[830]

3. There are four kinds of actions (*karman*) in regard to assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*niyāma*): *a*) action determinate as to the time of retribution, not determinate as to the retribution; *b*) action determinate as to the retribution, undeterminate as to the time of retribution; *c*) action determinate as to both points of view; *d*) action undeterminate as to both points of view.[831]

4. Greed (*abhidyā),* malevolence (*vyāpāda*) and wrong view (*mithyādṛṣṭi*) are mental actions (*manaskarman*), for the *Saṃcetanīyasūtra* considers them as actions.[832]

5. In the first three absorptions (*dhyāna*), the faculty of delight (*sukhendriya*) is bodily (*kāyika*) only and not mental (*caitasika*).[833] <161>

6) The heresy of individualism (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*) is without a real object.[834]

The heresy of individualism consists of believing that the self *(ātman*) and that which concerns it *(ātmanya*) really exist. Since in the absolute sense (*paramārthena*) neither *ātman* nor *ātmanya* exist, the heresy of individualism is thus without object. It is the same as a man who, seeing a rope, thinks: "That is a snake", or who, seeing a tree, thinks, "That is a man."

7. Knowledge (*jñāna*) is not simultaneous with consciousness (*vijñāna*).[835]

---

827 L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, pp. LII-LV; *Siddhi*, pp. 221-224.
828 Schiefner, *Tārarnātha*, p. 274.
829 L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 256. Cf. thesis 19 of the Sautrāntikas.
830 L. V. P., *Kośa*, IV, p. 19.
831 L. V. P: *Kośa*, IV, pp. 116-117.
832 L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 136. Cf. thesis 24 of the Sautrāntikas.
833 L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VIII, p. 151.
834 T. S., 1545, 36a.
835 Ibid., p. 44b. No explanation is given.

8. It is the group of aggregates (*skandha*) that sees forms (*rūpa*).[836]

9. Causes (*hetu*) and conditions (*pratyaya*) are not realities.[837]

In fact, the law of co-dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) teaches that ignorance (*avidyā*) conditions the physical composites (*saṃskāra*). But these are characterized as multiple and diverse, whereas ignorance is characterized as single. That which is single cannot be the condition of that which is multiple. Therefore condition and causality are not realities.

10. There are two universal (*sarvatraga*) latent tendencies (*anuśaya*), namely, ignorance (*avidyā)* and craving for existence (*bhavatṛṣṇā*).[838]

Actually, the roots (*mūla*) of co-dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) are what are called the universals. But ignorance (*avidya*) is the root of co-dependent origination constituting the earlier limit and the craving for existence (*bhavatṛṣṇā)* is the root constituting the later limit.

11. Outside of volition (*cetanā*) there is no cause of retribution (*vipākahetu*). Outside of sensation (*vedanā)* there is no fruit of retribution (*vipākaphala*).[839]

12) Although all things arise due to causes (*hetu*), they cease without cause.[840]

Examples: when an archer shoots an arrow, it soon falls down to the ground; similarly, the wheel of the potter stops after a certain time. In both cases, the fall and the stopping, i.e., the cessation of the movement, are produced by themselves without cause.

13. The latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) increase growth (*anuśayana*) neither in their objects *(ālambana*) nor in the dharmas associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).[841]

If the latent tendencies increased growth in their objects, it would be that they also increased growth in another realm (*dhātu*) and in pure dharmas (*anāsrava dharma*) when the latter are their objects. If they increase growth in dharmas associated with the mind, they would never be abandoned, or else they would always increase growth, for one cannot definitively disjoin the mind from that with which it is associated.

14. It is the mind (*citta*) provided with all the impediments *(āvaraṇa*) that attains deliverance (*vimukti*).[842]

` 15. The three cessations (*nirodha*) are without reality.[843]

These are cessation by means of discriminative knowledge (*pratīsaṃkhyanirodha*), cessation without discriminative knowledge (*apratisaṃkhyanirodha*) and cessation due to impermanence (*anityānirodha*). No proof is given for this thesis.[844]

16. Dream (*svapna*) has no reality.[845]

---

[836] Ibid., p. 61c. Cf. thesis 17 of the Sautrāntikas.
[837] Ibid., pp. 90a, 680bc and 833a.
[838] Ibid., p. 90c.
[839] Ibid., pp. 96a, 741b.
[840] Ibid., p. 103c and 105a.
[841] Ibid., p. 110a.
[842] Ibid., p. 141b.
[843] Ibid., p. 16a.
[844] See thesis 9 of the Sautrāntikas.
[845] T. S. 1545, p. 193b.

Common experience proves this. Thus, in a dream, one sees food and drink in profusion and one consumes it until completely satisfied. But as soon as one has awakened, one is thirsty and hungry and the body is weak and feeble. <162>

17. The characteristics of the composites (*saṃskṛta*) are not real substances (*dravy*a). [846]

Actually, these characteristics are included in the composites dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayuktasaṃskāra*), which are not real substances.

18. The moment (*kṣaṇa*) does not have the three characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of arising (*utpāda*), decline (*vyaya*) and cessation (*nirodha*).[847]

If the moment had these three characteristics, it would have to arise, decline and cease all at once, which is impossible.

19. Intention (*cetanā)* and mental speech (*manojalpa*) are merely mind (*citta*).[848]

20. Mundane nature (*pṛthagjanatva*) does not exist as reality.[849]

21. All the afflictions (*kleśa*) are completely bad (*akuśala*).[850]

22. The worldly person (*pṛthagjana*) in unable to abandon the afflictions (*kleśa*).[851]

23. There is investigation (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) from the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) up to the world of the Akaniṣṭha gods.[852]

The Dārṣṭāntikas rely on the Sūtra that defines conceptual analysis as the coarse (*sthūla*) nature of the mind *(citta*) and reflection as the subtle (*sūkṣma*) nature of the mind. Now this twofold nature of the mind manifests in the three realms (*dhātu*), thus analysis and reflection are found in the three realms.

24. Dharmas arise gradually (*anupūrvena*) and not all at once.[853]

25. The bonds (*saṃyojana*) truly exist, but their objects (*vastu*) and the individual (*pudgala*) are not real.[854]

The objects of the bonds are not real because objects (*viṣaya*) provided with or not provided with impurities are not determinate (*niyata*). Thus, an honest woman, adorned with jewels and ornaments, goes to a worldly gathering. The sight of her arouses in others very different feelings: admiration, greed, hatred, envy, disgust, sadness, indifference, according to the personal latent tendencies of each.

26. Passion (*rāga*) and aversion (*pratigha*) are the only factors of continuity (*saṃtati*) in the vital series from one existence to the next.

At the moment of conception, the Gandharva, whose presence is necessary, always experiences a twofold mind: it loves one of the parents and hates the other. This is why passion and aversion are the only factors of reincarnation that ensure the continuity of the vital series.

---

[846] Ibid., pp. 198a and 977b.
[847] Ibid., p. 200a.
[848] Ibid., p. 216b.
[849] Ibid., p. 231b.
[850] Ibid., p. 259c.
[851] Ibid., p. 264b.
[852] Ibid., pp. 269b and 462c.
[853] Ibid., pp. 270a and 463a.
[854] Ibid., p. 288b.

27. Only the person who conquers the afflictions (*kleśa*) obtains a higher rebirth.[855]

28. All actions (*karman*) can be reversed.[856]

Even the actions said to be unpardonable *(ānantaryakarman*) can be reversed, without which the supremacy of the good actions of the Akaṇiṣṭha gods would no longer be a supremacy. Consequently, all actions can be <163> redeemed by good actions.

29. Non-information (*avijñapti*) does not exist.[857]

In other words, there is no form (*rūpa*) in the realm of the mental object (*dharmāyatana*).

30. Time (*kāla*) is distinct from the composites (*saṃskāra*).[858]

Actually, time is permanent (*nitya*) whereas the composites are impermanent (*anitya*). The composites are within time like a fruit in a jar. Just as the fruit can come out of this jar and be put into another, or like many men come out of one house and enter into another, so the composites come out of the future (*anāgata*) and enter into the present (*pratyutpanna*), then come out of the present and enter into the past (*atīta*).

31. The truths (*satya*) are defined thus. The Truth of suffering (*duḥkha*) is name (*nāman*) and form (*rūpa*). The Truth of the origin (*samudaya*) is actions (*karman*) and the afflictions (*kleśa*). The Truth of cessation (*nirodha*) is the exhaustion (*kṣaya*) of actions and afflictions. The Truth of the Path (*mārga*) is peace *(śamatha*) and discernment (*vipaśyanā).*[859]

32. As the six consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) each have distinct objects, the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) does not take as object those of the five sensory consciousnesses.[860]

33. As the six consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) have only external objects, they do not take as object either the inner faculties (*indriya*) or the consciousnesses themselves.[861]

34. The obtainments (*prāpti*) and the noon-obtainments (*aprāpti*) do not truly exist.[862]

The obtainments are merely pure designations (*prajñapti*). When beings do not abandon things, there is said to be obtainment. When they abandon things, there is said to be noon-obtainment (*aprāpti*). It is the same for the group of the five fingers, which is called the hand.

35. The presentiment (*kṣānti*) that makes up part of clear understanding (*abhisamayāntika*) has the nature of knowledge (*jñānatva*).[863]

When, at the beginning, pure (*anāsrava*) knowledge has ceasing as object (*viṣaya*), it is called *kṣānti*. When, later, it has stability (*sthiti*) as object, it is called *jñāna*.

---

[855] Ibid., p. 355a.
[856] Ibid., pp. 359b and 593b.
[857] Ibid., pp. 383b and 634b. Cf. thesis 14 of the Sautrāntikas.
[858] Ibid., p. 393a, 700a. See *Kathāvatthu*, XV, 3, anonymous thesis: the three moments (*addhā)* of time, i.e., past, present and future are complete (*parinipphanna*).
[859] T. S. 1545, p. 397b.
[860] Ibid., p. 449a.
[861] Ibid., p. 449a
[862] Ibid., pp. 479a and 550c.
[863] Ibid., p. 489b.

36. If a mind (*citta*) is endowed with knowledge (*jñāna*), it is without ignorance (*ajñāna*). If a mind is provided with uncertainty (*vicikitsā),* it is without certainty (*niyāma*). If a mind is provided with coarseness (*sthūlatā*), it is without subtlety (*sūkṣmatā*).[864]

37. The means of right livelihood (*saṃyagājīva*) and wrong livelihood (*mithyājīva*) are distinct substances of words (*vāc*) and actions (*karman*).[865]

Actually, the Buddha said in a Sūtra that each of the eight members of the Path has its own distinct substance.

38. Magical creation (*nirmāṇa*) is not real.[866] <164>

39. Contact (*sparśā)* is not real.[867]

Actually, the Sūtra says: "The eye (*cakṣus*) and form (*rūpa*) produce visual consciousness (*cakṣurvijñāna*). The group of the three form contact (*sparśa*)." Outside of the eye, form and visual consciousness, there is no external reality that could be called contact.

40. A subtle (*sūkṣma*) mind persists in the absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*).[868]

If no mind persisted in the absorption of cessation, the vital faculty would thus be interrupted. In other words there would be death (*maraṇa*) for the meditator.

41. There is reversal (*parihāṇi*) for the person who is in the absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*).[869]

This is a corollary to the preceding thesis[870] according to which all actions are reversible. In this case, reversal is always possible.

42. There is mixing of meditations (*dhyāna*).[871]

Meditations perfume themselves mutually.

43. One enters into the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*niyāma*) by meditating only on the suffering of the composites (*saṃskāraduḥkhatā*).[872]

44. The three categories (*rāśi*) of beings of beings are encountered from Avici hell up to Akaṇiṣṭha heaven.[873]

These are the three categories of beings: those predestined to salvation, those predestined to fall, those who are not predestined.

45. Names (*nāman*), phrases (*pada*) and phonemes (*vyañjana*) do not truly exist and have sound (*śabda*) as their self nature (*svabhāva*).[874]

46. Mind (*citta*) and mental event (*caitta*) dharmas are not produced at the same time.[875]

---

[864] Ibid., p. 547b.
[865] Ibid., p. 604c.
[866] Ibid., p. 700a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, p. 9-11.
[867] T. S. 1545, p. 760a.
[868] Ibid., pp. 774a and 775a.
[869] Ibid., 773c-774a.
[870] Thesis 28
[871] T. S. 1545,p. 879c.
[872] Ibid., p. 928a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 125.
[873] T. S. 1545, p. 930c. Cf. L. V. P.: Kośa, III, p. 137.
[874] Ibid., p. 70a.

Just as a caravan of merchants, crossing a gorge between steep mountains, walk one behind the other and not two by two, minds and mental events are produced one after the other.

47. Exmination (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) are mind (*citta*).[876]

48. There are knowledges (*jñāna*) the objects *(ālambana*) of which do not exist.[877]

When the object of a knowledge is of illusory *(māyā)* nature, whether it is a city of the Gandharvas, a circle of fire [produced by a glowing ember being whirled about rapidly], a mirage (*mṛgatṛṣṇā),* etc., the knowledge resulting from it has no objective domain (*viṣaya*).

49. There is neither exact moment of production nor exact moment of cessation.[878]

The composites (*samskṛta*) exist in only two times: when they are not yet produced and they have already been produced, or when they are not yet produced and when they have already ceased. <165>

50. The images reflected on the surface of water or in a mirror have no true existence.[879]

The face does not enter into the mirror and the mirror does not occur in the face, so how then could the mirror produce real images of the face?

51. Sounds have no true existence.[880]

Having an instantaneous (*kṣaṇika*) nature (*bhāva*), all sounds are produced and cease in the same place and in the same instant. Then how could they reach into a valley, etc., and produce an echo?

52. Minds (*citta*) are similar and immediately preceding conditions (*samanantarapratyaya*) in regard to minds and not in regard to mental events (*caitta*). Mental events are similar and immediately preceding conditions in regard to mental events and not in regard to minds.[881]

53. Good (*kuśala*) and impure (*sāsrava*) wisdom (*prajñā)* associated (*saṃprayukta*) with the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) is never seeing (*darśana*).[882]

54. Physical actions (*kāryakarman*), vocal actions (*vākkarman*) and mental actions are only (*eka*) intention (*cetanā).*[883]

55. On the levels (*bhūmi*) having close members (*antikāṇga*), there are only good (*kuśala*) dharmas.[884]

56. Objects created magically (*nirmāṇavastu*) have no true existence.[885]

If they truly existed, why is it said that they are created magically?

57. There is no premature death (*akālamaraṇa*).[886]

This thesis relies on the Sūtra that says: "One cannot remedy death."

---

875 Ibid., p. 79c.
876 Ibid., p. 218c.
877 Ibid., p. 228b.
878 Ibid., pp. 141b and 949b.
879 Ibid., p. 390c.
880 Ibid., p. 390c.
881 Ibid., p. 461b.
882 Ibid., p. 502a.
883 Ibid, p. 587a.
884 Ibid., p. 693c.
885 Ibid., pp. 696c and 700a.
886 Ibid., p. 771a.

58. In the absorption without perception (*asaṃjñāsamāpatti*), the subtle (*sūkṣma*) mind (*citta*) has not ceased (*niruddha*).[887]

If there were no mind in the absorption without perception, the vital faculty (*jīvitendriya*) would be destroyed and this state would have to be called death and not absorption.

59. Decline (*parihāṇi*) has no real self nature (*svabhāva*), it is merely a designation (*prajñapti*).[888]

In the body, there previously were good (*kuśala*) merits (*puṇya*). Now, subsequently, following fortuitous circumstances, they have been lost. What is the self nature of these things? Similarly, if someone asks a man whose wealth has been stolen by a thief: "What is the nature of the wealth that you have lost?", the owner would reply: "Previously I had this wealth. Now a thief has stolen it from me and I have no more wealth. How would I know what their nature is?"

60. Abandonment (*prahāna*) of the roots of good (*kuśalamūla*) has no self nature (*svabhāva*).[889]

Abandonment of the roots of good is only cessation (*nirodha*), the absence of the latter. <166>

61. There exists a certain form (*rūpa*) that is neither color (*varna*) nor shape (*saṃsthāna*), which is produced by the mind (*citta*). It makes the hand and the other limbs move. It is called action of information by means of the body (*kāyavijñaptikarman*).[890]

62. It is the earlier moment that perfumes (*vāsayati*) the later moment.[891] <167>

[887] Ibid., p. 772c.
[888] Ibid., 313a.
[889] Ibid., p. 182c.
[890] L. V. P.: Siddhi, p. 48.
[891] Ibid., pp. 183 and 186.

CHAPTER XXIV

The Vibhajyavādins

The question of the Vibhajyavādins is one of the most difficult of the general problems of the sects. This is how the question is asked: do the Vibhajyavādins constitute a distinct and clearly determined sect, or does their name merely designate a group of more or less heterogeneous sects? In the first case, it is still a question of precisely defining what they are as well as the characteristic features of their history and their doctrine. In the second case, it is necessary to determine the feature or features common to the various sects designated under its name and define, as much as possible, what these sects are.

Modern scholars have, for a long time, been preoccupied with resolving the question without however, coming to any agreement. Some of them, generally those better informed about the ins and outs of the problem, have, after deep study of the facts, refused to commit themselves.[892]

We must confess that the question is confused to a large degree by the fact of the late commentators whose information is uncertain - if even the information that they give us is not simply personal hypotheses. We should recall first of all what the word Vibhajyavādin means: 'the one who speaks about, who maintains, the theory of distinctions (*vibhajya*)', or 'the one who maintains a distinct separate theory', thus a heretic. The meaning of the word has certainly varied with the authors who have used it.[893]

A. – *Early Documents*

1) The Sarvāstivādin *Vibhāṣā*, which dates from around 200 C.E., is both the earliest and the most important of the documents on the Vibhajyavādins, to whom it attributes a rather large number of theses which we will examine later and which form a very eclectic doctrine. The Vibhajyavādins are often alone contrasted with the Yuktavādins, i.e., those who teach the correct principles, in this case the Sarvāstivādin-Vaibhāṣikas.[894] In these passages, especially in the first cited in the note, the Vibhajyavādins seem to be heretical types, 'those who object, who hold bad doctrines and attack the correct doctrine'. It seems, therefore, that the *Vibhāṣā* designates heretics in general, those who do not adhere to the doctrine upheld by it, by the name Vibhajyavādin, when its authors are unable or do not want to define their adversaries more precisely. <168> The word Vibhajyavādin is thus a general term used to designate those who are not Sarvāstivādin-Vaibhāṣikas and, perhaps more particularly, a group of sects that we will try to define later.

---

[892] See L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, pp. LV-LVIII, where most of the documents are cited: Dutt: *Early Monastic Buddhism*, II, pp. 195-200 and 265-270; Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 49, note summarizing the works of Akanuma and Kimura.

[893] Cf. T. S. 1545, p. 738a.

[894] T. S. 1545, pp. 43a, 571c and 138c, 169 seq, 69 seq., etc.

In the *Abhidharmakośaśāstra*, Vasubandhu defines them thus: "Those who accept the existence of the present and part of the past [namely, action that has not born fruit] and the non-existence of the future and part of the past [namely, action that has born its fruit], are held to be Vibhajyavādins; they do not belong to the Sarvāstivādin school."[895] The Kāśyapīyas, whose fundamental thesis we recognize here in all certainty, are thus Vibhajyavādins. But are they the only Vibhajyavādins? Vasubandhu does not answer this question.

Saṃghabhadra, who distinguishes them clearly from the *pudgalavādin* 'increasers', the instantaneists and the Prajñaptivādins, attributes the following opinion to them: "Only the present and the past action that has not yet born its fruit exist."[896] He is thus in agreement with Vasubandhu.

Vasuvarman, who also distinguishes them from the Prajñaptivādins, attributes to them this thesis: "All composites (*saṃskṛta*) are entirely suffering (*duḥkha*) because they are impermanent (*anitya*)",[897] which is a Prajñaptivādin thesis.

Finally, the 1st list of Bhavya, whose origin is in the north-west of India, the stronghold of the Sarvāstivādins, identifies the Vibhajyavādins with the Sarvāstivādins, which is in flat disagreement with the *Vibhāṣā:* "Even among them [the Sarvāstivādins], there are some who say: 'Past actions the fruit of which has not fallen exist. Some do not exist, i.e., those the fruit of which has not been tasted, and the future.' Because, having made these distinctions *(vibhajya*) they speak of them, they are called precisely Vibhajyavādins." This thesis is that of the Kāśyapīyas and the author is in agreement with Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra on this point.

2) The Ceylonese Theravādins of the Mahāvihāra several times designate themselves by the name of Vibhajjavādī.[898]

During the synod of Pāṭaliputta, the president, Tissa Mogalliputta, answered king Asoka who asked him what the doctrine of the Buddha was, that it was Vibhajjavādī: "Kiṃ vādī bhante Sammāsambuddhoti? – Vibhajavādī Mahārājāti. Evaṃ vutte rājā theraṃ pucchi: Vibhajavādī Sammāsambuddhoti." According to the context, what Tissa Moggaliputta meant was that the Buddha was neither an eternalist (*sassatavādī*) nor an annihilationist (*ucchedavādī*) nor a partisan of the survival of consciousness (*saññīvādī*) nor a partisan of non-survival of consciousness (*asaññnīvādī*), etc., but towards each of these great problems, he adopted a cautious attitude, distinguishing (*vibhajja*) the pros and cons of each doctrine.[899] But this late explanation (5th century C.E.) is hardly satisfactory because all Buddhists were Vibhajjavādī in this way. Actually, this position is defined in the well-known *Brahmajālasūtra* adopted by all sects. It cannot thus serve to distinguish one sect from the others, as the Theravādin tradition of the Mahāvihāra seems to do. On the other hand, it cannot serve either as criterion of orthodoxy during a Buddhist council since it had been

[895] L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, p. 52 and Introduction, p. LVI.
[896] T. S. 1563, p. 901bc; T. S. 1562, p. 630c.
[897] T. S. 1647, p. 390a.
[898] *Dīpavaṃsa*, XVIII, 4, 44; *Mahāvaṃsa*, V, 271; *Kathāvatthu-Aṭṭhakathā,* beginning; *Cullavagga*, p. 72, 312; *Tikapaṭṭhāna-Aṭṭhakathā,* pp. 366-367.
[899] *Mahāvaṃsa*, V, 271; *Kathāvatthu-Aṭṭhakathā,* end of the *Nidāna*.

adopted by all the parties present. Therefore it is probable that in the 5th century C.E. the Theravādins and, more particularly, perhaps those of the Mahāvihāra, <169> continued to consider themselves as Vibhajjavādī, a name which they had proclaimed as expressing their orthodox position during the synod held at Pāṭaliputra under the reign of Aśoka in the 3rd century B.C.E., seven hundred years earlier, but which the special meaning of this name had been lost.

3) The Sammatīya tradition cited by Bhavya (3rd list) makes the Vibhajyavādins a dissident sect of the Sarvāstivādins, a sect which would then split up into Mahīśāska, Dharmaguptaka, Tāmraśātīya and Kāśyapīya. We may note in this group the presence of the Kāśyapīyas whose fundamental thesis Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra and the author of the 1st list of Bhavya define as especially Vibhajyavādin. We also may note that the Ceylonese Theravādins, who designate themselves by the name of Vibhajjavādī, certainly belong to the group thus defined here, since their close relationship with the Mahīśāskas is undeniable.[900]

4) The Mahāsāṇgika tradition cited by Bhavya (2nd list) makes the Vibhajyavādins one of the three fundamental groups, beside the Sthaviras and the Mahāsānghikas. According to it, the group of the Vibhajyavādins has four divisions: Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, Dharmaguptaka and Tāmraśātīya. The agreement with the Sammatīyas, although independent, is complete. The same comments may be made as before.

Consequently, the comparative systematic study of the Indian data prior to the 5th century C.E. shows that the four distinct traditions (Sarvāstivādin, Theravādin, Sammitīya and Mahāsāṇghika) agree or do not agree on the following points:

1) The Vibhajyavādins are not Sarvastivādins.

2) The Kāśyapīyas are part of the Vibhajyavādins.

3) The Theravādins, and consequently the Mahīśāskas, who are their closest relatives, are also part of the Vibhajyavādins.

4) The Dharmaguptakas, a sect coming directly from the Mahīśāsakas, are also part of the Vibhajyavādins.

5) The Tāmraśātīyas, whom we know but poorly, are also part of this group.

6) The Vibhajyavādins represent the group of the non-Vātsīputrīya Sthaviras who rejected the *Sarvastivāda*. Following the council of Pāṭaliputra held under Aśoka, the non-Vātsīputrīya Sthaviras split into two groups, the Sarvāstivādins, partisans of the Sarvāstivāda, and the Vibhajyavādins who rejected it. The leader of the Vibhajyavādins was this Tissa Moggalliputta who may be identified, as La Vallée Poussin has shown,[901] with the Maudgalyāyana who criticized the *Sarvastivāda* in the *Vijñānakāya* of the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Sarvastivādins.[902] He even gives his name to the part of this work in which he is in question and which opens the treatise. Later, the Vibhajyavādins divided into several sects. First,

[900] See below, chap. XXIX.
[901] L. V. P.: *L'Inde au temps des Maurya*, pp. 133-139.
[902] T. S. 1539, pp. 531a t0 537a.

undoubtedly towards the beginning of the 3rd century C.E., a schism into two schools, the Mahīśāsakas, partisans of a total rejection of the *Sarvāstivāda*, and the Kāśyapīyas who adopted a compromise position. Later, various causes provoked the appearance of differences from which new schools resulted: the Theravādins of Ceylon, the Mahīśāsakas of the north and the south, the Dharmaguptakas and the Tāmraśātīyas. <170>

B. – *Recent Documents*

1) In his Chinese translation of Vasumitra's treatise, Paramārtha (first half of the 6th century) renders the word Prajñaptivādin by *fen-pie-chouo-pou*, an expression that more precisely translates the term Vibhajyavādin. In his commentary on the same treatise, he explains this word by saying that the founder of the Prajñaptivādin school, Mahākātyāyana, established distinctions (*vibhajya*) in the teaching of the mother-sect of the Bahuśrutīyas, whence the name of the new school, Vibhajyavādin, or more exactly, Bahuśrutīya-Vibhajyavādin.[903]

In his commentary to the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, K'ouei-ki (middle of the 7th century) says: "Those who were once called Vibhajyavādin are now called Prajñaptivādin."[904] This information is evidently taken from the works of Paramārtha and is, as we can easily see, poorly understood and biased. In no way should we conclude that all the Vibhajyādins, in particular those of the *Vibhāṣā,* Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra, and also the Theravādins, are Prajñaptivādins.

2) Besides, in another passage in the same work, K'ouei-ki says: "The Vibhajyavādins are the Mahāsāṇghikas, Ekavyāvahārikas, Lokottaravādins and Kaukkuṭikas."[905] But these four sects are very different from the Prajñaptivādins, a late school derived from the last of them. This opinion is not improbable since these four sects totally rejected the Sarvāstivāda[906] and thus merited being designated by the name Vibhajyavādin by the Sarvāstivādins. We may wonder if the Mahāsāṇghika sects were not also present at the Pāṭaliputra synod held under the reign of Aśoka from which the schism between the Sarvāstivādins and the Vibhajyavādins resulted. This would explain why the Sarvāstivādins place the schism of the Mahāsāṇghikas under Aśoka: they confused two schisms and two councils, both held at Pāṭaliputra and in which they were twice defeated by the Mahāsāṇghikas; but, the second time, the latter were not alone and the majority of the Sthaviras joined forces with them to condemn the *Sarvāstivāda*.[907] This is just a hypothesis. However it may be, it is possible *a priori* that the Mahāsāṇghikas, who rejected the *Sarvāstivāda* like most of the Sthaviras, were, by this fact, considered as Vibhajyavādins by the authors of the *Vibhāṣā.* This would explain the presence of Mahāsāṇghika theses among those which the Vibhāṣā attributes to the Vibhajyavādins.

---

[903] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 22 and 49-50.
[904] L. V. P.: *Siddhi*, p. 179, n. 2; Kośa, *Introduction*, pp. LV-LVI.
[905] L. V. P.: *Siddhi*, p. 109; *Kośa*, Introduction, p. LV.
[906] See above, chap. 1, thesis 47 of the Mahāsāṇghikas.
[907] See above, part I, chap. II.

3) P'ou-kouang, a contemporary of K'ouei-ki and, like him, a disciple of Hiuan-tsang, defined the Vibhajyavādins in his commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa* in this way: "They say that there is no opinion that is completely right; a distinction should be made: in part existence, in part non-existence [or: in part true, in part not true]. Therefore they are called Vibhajyavādins."[908] His explanation is clearly a reconstitution based on the etymology which tells us nothing.

4) Houei-tchou, who belonged to the following generation and was a disciple of Hiuan-tsang and K'ouei-ki, says in his commentary on the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*: "The Vibhajyavādins either are the divergent teachers of the Greater Vehicle, or else all the schools of the Lesser Vehicle are called Vibhajyavādin: <171> the latter are not an established school. Consequently, in the *Mahāyānasaṃgraha*, the Vibhajyavādins are explained as Mahīśāsakas; in the *Vibhāṣā,* as Sāmattīyas." [909] In this context, La Vallée Poussin notes: "This is obscure; the *Saṃgraha* cites the Āgama of the Mahīśāskas and ignores the Vibhajyavādins; the *Vibhāṣā,* it seems, ignores the Sāmmatīyas." It is not extraordinary that the *Vibhāṣā,* which dates from the end of the 2nd century, ignores the Sammatīyas. At that time, the latter had not yet acquired the importance that they had in the 7th century and the *Vibhāṣā* certainly classes them among the Vārsīputrīyas just as, in the 7th century, the situation being the reverse, Hiuan-tsang and I-tsing place the Vātsīputrīyas among the Sammatīyas. Examination of the theses attributed to the Vibhajyavādins by the *Vibhāṣā* shows that the latter do not have a great deal in common with the Sammatīyas. But what is important in Houei-tchao's note is that it proves clearly that its author was very badly informed and very embarrassed by the question. First he hesitates between two hypotheses, both being absurd, then the Vibhajyavādins are not part of the Mahāyāna and they were not known to be considered as "all the Hīnayāna schools" since the *Vibhāṣā,* Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra, etc., prove, in an irrefutable manner, that the Sarvāstivādins were not Vibhajyavādins. Then Houei-tchao gives two identifications of which the second proves to be false. This mixture of obvious errors makes us think that, in the preceding generation, K'ouei-ki and P'ou-kouang were not very much better informed. That would explain their contradictions and their unsatisfactory explanations.

4) In the 8th century, Vinītadeva made the Vibhajyavādins the seventh and last sect of the Sarvāstivādin group, but he distinguished them clearly from the Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Kāśyapīya and Tāmraśātīya classified on the one hand into the same group and, on the other hand, into the Ceylonese Sthavira group. He attributes to them five or six theses which we will examine later and the eclectic nature of which makes one very skeptical. Among them, in fact, are found fundamental theses of the Vātsīputrīyas and of the Kāśyapīyas, a Dārṣṭāṇtika thesis and another which the poor condition of the text (or an error by the translator) renders impossible to interpret. Nevertheless, we note that he also distinguishes the Vibhajyavādins, classed among the Sarvāstivādins, from the Prajñaptivādins, classed among the Mahāsāṇghikas.

[908] Cited by L.V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, p. LVI.
[909] Cited by L. V. P.: *Kośa*, Introduction, p. LVI.

5) Finally, the *Bhikṣuvarṣāgrapṛcchāsūtra*, clearly later, placses the Vibhajyavādins among the Mahāsāṇghikas, beside the Prajñaptivādins. It places the Kāśyapīyas, Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas in the group of the Sarvāstivādins and places the Tāmraśātīyas in the middle of the Sammatīyas, beside the Bahuśrutīyas. In the face of so many manifest errors, one might think of depending as little as possible on the evidence of this work.

There is then nothing to be drawn from these last works which are full of errors and can only lead to confusion. At least provisionally, we will hold to the conclusions drawn from the study of the early works.

Here are the theses which the *Vibhāṣā* attributes to the Vibhajyavādins:

1. Sound (*śabda*) is fruit of maturation (*vipākaphala*).[910]

It is said in the Sūtra that the Bodhisattva, having abandoned coarse and bad speech in the course of his previous existences, attains the heavenly sound <172> (*brahmasvara*) as a result of the accomplishment of this action. This is why it is said that sound is the fruit of maturation.

2. The body of birth (*janmakāya*) of the Buddha is a pure (*anāsrava*) dharma.[911]

It is said in the Sūtra: "The Tathāgatas are born into the world, reside in the world, appear in the world, but they are not defiled by worldly (*laukika*) dharmas." This is why it is said that the birth-body of the Buddha is a pure dharma.

3. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*śraddhā),* etc., are exclusively pure (*anāsrava*).[912]

This thesis is based on a Sūtra according to which, according to the degree of development of these faculties, one obtains one or another of the four fruits of sainthood whereas the person who is completely without them is a worldly person.

4. Life *(āyus*) is a result of the mind (*cittānuparivartin*).[913]

It is said in the Sūtra: "Life, heat, and consciousness (*vijñāna*) are always joined and never separate." Thus, these three things cannot be designated as separate, disjunct, different. This is why we know from evidence that life is resultant on the mind.

5. In the absorption without perception (*asaṃjñisamāpatti*) the subtle (*sūkṣma*) mind (*citta*) is not destroyed (*niruddha*).[914]

In the absorption without perception, if there were no mind, the vital faculty (*jīvitendriya*) would then be cut and [this state] would have to be called death and not called abiding in absorption.

6. In the absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*), the subtle (*sūkṣma*) mind (*citta*) is not destroyed.[915]

---

[910] T. S. 1545, p. 612c. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 69; *Siddhi*, p. 190.
[911] Ibid., p. 871c. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 58, n. 4; Siddhi, pp. 769-770.
[912] Ibid., p. 7c. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, p. 118; T. S. 1548, p. 567c.
[913] Ibid., p. 770c. Cf. L. V. P.: Kośa, II, p. 245.
[914] Ibid., pp. 772c. Cf. L. V. P.: Kośa, VIII, p. 207 and II, p. 211.
[915] Ibid., p. 774a. Cf. L. V. P.: Kośa, II, p. 212.

There is no being (*sattva*) without matter (*rūpa*) or absorption (*samāpatti*) without mind (*citta*). If there were no mind in this absorption, the vital faculty (*jīvitendriya*) would be cut and [this state] would have to be called death and not abiding in absorption.

7) In the three realms (*dhātu*), when one is reborn, there is no intermediary existence (*antarābhava*).[916]

The immediate retribution, without intermediary *(ānantarya*), of the five heinous crimes proves that there is no intermediary existence. It is said in the Sūtras: "O twice-born, you are old and sick, you will be reborn in the realm of Yama. There is no intermediary (*antarā)* stay for you, nor any provisions for the journey." Moreover, no more is there an intermediary stage between life and death than there is between light and shadow. As for the Antarāparinirvāyin, he obtains complete extinction whether in the middle of his life or in the interval of his stay among the gods.

8. Co-dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) is non-composite (*saṃskṛta*).[917]

9. The Path (*mārga*) is non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*).[918] <173>

Actually, supreme complete perfect enlightenment (*anuttarasamyaksaṃbodhi*) is unique, constant , stable, indestructible, and it is because of it that the Buddhas appear in the world. Moreover, in a Sūtra, the Buddha has said that the Path is ancient. Consequently, it is non-composite.

10. Aspiration (*abhidhyā),* malevolence (*vyāpāda*) and wrong view (*mithyādṛṣṭi*) are, in their self nature (*svabhāva*), action (*karman*).[919]

It is said in the Sūtra: " The three kinds of physical action (*kāyakarman*) that create intention (*cetanā*) when they are accomplished, when they are produced, are evil (*pāpa*) and bad (*akuśala*). They are able to give rise to suffering (*duḥkha*) and provoke an unhappy maturation (*vipāka*). The four kinds of vocal action (*vākkarman*) that create intention, and the three kinds of mental action (*manaskarman*), when they are accomplished, when they are produced, are evil and bad. They are able to give rise to suffering and provoke an unhappy maturation." Now the three mental actions are aspiration, malevolence and wrong view. On the strength of this Sūtra, it is said that aspiration, etc., all three have a self nature of action.

11. That which is good (*kuśala*) in its self nature (*svabhāva*) is knowledge (*jñāna*). That which is good in its association (*samprayoga*) is the consciousness (*vijñāna*) associated with it. That which is good in its origin (*samuttāna*) are the physical actions (*kāyakarman*) and vocal actions (*vākkarman*) produced by it. That which is absolutely (*paramārthatas*) good is extinction (*nirvāṇa*). That which is bad (*akuśala*) in its self nature is delusion (*moha*). That which is bad by association is the consciousness associated with it. That which is bad in its origin are the physical and vocal actions produced by it. That which is absolutely bad is transmigration (*saṃsāra*).[920]

---

[916] Ibid., pp. 356c, 700a, 878bc. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, p. 32 where there is the difficult explanation of the case of the *antarāparinirvāṇāyin*: T. S. 1545, p. 357b; L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III, p. 39.
[917] Ibid., p. 116c. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, III p. 77. See thesis 9 of the Pūrvaśailas.
[918] Ibid. p. 479c.
[919] Ibid., p. 587a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 136 which attributes it to the Dārṣṭāṇtikas.
[920] Ibid., p. 741a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 33.

12. The mind (*citta*) of the Bhagavat is always in absorption (*samāpatti*).[921]

Actually, his memory (*smṛti*) and his right awareness are good, calm and stable.

13. The Buddha never sleeps.[922]

Actually, he is rid of all the obstacles *(āvaraṇa*).

14. The thirst for non-existence (*vibhavatṛṣṇā)* must be abandoned (*prahātavya*) by seeing (*darśana*).[923]

The impermanence (*anityatā)* of the three worlds (*dhātu*) is called non-existence (*vibhava*). The desire (*kāma*) that can have the latter as its object *(ālambana*) is called craving for non-existence. Since impermanence is abandoned by seeing and meditating (*bhāvanā),* the craving (*tṛṣṇā)* that has it as object is thus abandoned by these two.

15. There are twelve mistakes (*viparyāsa*): eight must be abandoned (*prahātavya*) by seeing (*darśana*) alone, and four must be abandoned by meditation (*bhāvanā).*[924]

From impermanence (*anityatā)* there arise the mistakes of perception (*saṃjñā),* of the mind (*citta*) and of view (*dṛṣṭi*) about permanence (*nityatā).* From suffering (*duḥkha*) there arises happiness (*sukha*). From egolessness (*anātmaka*) <174> there arises the ego principle *(ātman*). From impurity (*aśuddha*) there arise the mistakes of consciousness, of the mind and of the view about purity (*viśuddhi*). This is how we know that all the mistakes are of twelve kinds. Among them, eight must be abandoned by seeing only: in impermanence and the self principle, everybody grasps three happinesses, and in purity, everybody grasps the mistake of view. Four must be abandoned by meditation: in happiness and purity, everybody grasps two mistakes of perception and of mind.

16. That which has eight characteristics of suffering (*duḥkha*) is both suffering and the Truth (*satya*) of suffering. The other impure (*sāsrava*) dharmas are suffering but are not Truth of suffering. The craving (*tṛṣṇā)* that calls forth a subsequent existence (*bhava*) is origin (*samudaya*) and the Truth of origin. The other cravings and other causes (*hetu*) of impure dharmas are origin but are not Truths of origin. Destruction (*kṣaya*) of the craving that calls forth a subsequent existence is cessation (*nirodha*) and the Truth of cessation. The destruction of the other cravings and the other causes of impure dharmas are cessation but not the Truth of cessation. The eightfold noble Path *(āryamārga*) of those in training (*śaikṣa*) is Path (*mārga*) and the Truth of Path. The other dharmas concerning those in training and everything concerning those beyond training (*aśaikṣa*) are Path but not the Truth of Path.[925]

17. Clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the four Truths takes place at one single time.[926]

It is said in a Sūtra that if one does not have any doubts about the Truth of suffering, one will have no doubt about the other three Truths.

---

[921] Ibid., p. 410b. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 40.
[922] Ibid., p. 410b. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 40.
[923] Ibid., p. 138bc. Cf. L. V. P. *Kośa*,V, p. 29.
[924] Ibid., p. 536c. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, V, pp. 23-24.
[925] Ibid., p. 397b. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 123.
[926] Ibid., p. 533ab. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 185.

18. There is no reversal (*parihāṇi*) of the Arhant in the sense (*artha*) of producing passion (*kleśa*).[927]

Just as when the pitcher is broken or when the tree is burned, there no longer is a pitcher or a tree except for the shards and the cinders, so when the afflictions (*kleśa*) are destroyed, burned, they can no longer re-arise and the Arhant cannot fall.

19. There are forty-one factors of enlightenment (*bodhipākṣika*): the four truths (*satya*) and the thirty-seven factors of enlightenment (*bodhyaṇga*).[928]

20. There is form (*rūpa*) in the formless world *(ārūpyadhātu*).[929]

According to a Sūtra, name and form (*nāmarūpa*) have consciousness as condition (*vijñānapratyaya*). Since consciousness exists in the formless world, name and form must also exist there. It is said in another Sūtra: "Life *(āyus*), heat (*uṣma*) and consciousness (*vijñāna*) are all three always associated and never separate." As there is life and consciousness in beings of the formless realm, there must therefore also be heat, i.e., something material. It is said in another Sūtra: "Outside of form, sensation (*vedanā),* perception (*saṃjñā)* and mental formations (*saṃskāra*), one cannot say that consciousness possesses basis, death or birth." Since consciousness exists in the formless realm, its four bases must also exist there and, in particular, form.

21. Only the first *dhyāna* possesses members (*aṇga*).[930] <175>

It is said in the Sūtra: "How many members are there in the first meditation? – O venerable one, there are five members, namely, examination (*vitarka*), reflection (*vicāra*), joy (*prīti*), happiness (*sukha*) and concentration of the mind (*ekāgracittatā*)." Since the devoted layperson did not ask her: "What are the members of the higher meditations?", the nun (*bhikṣuṇi*) did not teach him that. This is why we know that there are no members in the higher meditations.

22). As there is an Arhant "at the same head" [French: à la tĪte égale, at the same high level?] (*samaśīrṣin*), when this disciple of the Buddha is reborn in the domain of neither perception nor non-perception (*nevasaṃjñānāsaṃjñāyatana*), at the end of his life, his afflictions (*kleśa*), his actions (*karman*) and his life (*jīvita*) are exhausted all three together, and thus it is not by the noble Path *(āryamārga*) that he attains the fruit of Arhant.[931]

23. The fundamental nature (*mūlabhāva*) of the mind (*citta*) is pure (*prabhāsvara*). It is the adventitious defilements *(āgantukakleśa*) that soil it.[932]

It is the mind associated (*saṃprayukta*) with desire (*kāma*), hatred (*dveṣa*) and ignorance (*moha*) that obtains deliverance (*vimukti*). There is no difference in the substance (*dravya*) of the afflicteded mind and that of the non-afflicted mind. If, after having become associated with the afflictions (*kleśa*), it has not yet abandoned them, we call it afflicted mind. It is just like a brass vase or any other vessel. When it is not yet

[927] Ibid., p. 312b. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, pp. 253 and 264.
[928] Ibid., p. 499a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 281.
[929] Ibid., p. 431b-432a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VIII, pp. 135-141.
[930] Ibid., p.813c-814a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VIII, pp. 132-133 and 147-161.
[931] Ibid., pp. 929b-310c.
[932] Ibid., p.140b. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, VI, p. 299.

rid of dirt (*mala*), it is called a vase that is dirty (*samala*). When it is rid of its dirt, it is called a vase without dirt (*vimala*). It is the same for the mind.

24. Five dharmas are universal (*sarvatraga*): ignorance (*avidyā)*, craving (*tṛṣṇā),* speculative theory (*dṛṣṭi*), pride (*māna*), and mind (*citta*).[933]

The stanza says: "There are five universal things that everywhere spread the suffering (*duḥkha*) of beings (*sattva*); these are ignorance, craving, speculative theory, pride, and mind; these are the five."

25. The strength of the body (*kāyabala*) and the weakness of the body do not have two distinct self natures (*svabhāva*).[934]

When the mind (*citta*) is strong (*balavāt*), we speak of the strength of the body. When the mind is without strength (*abala*), we speak of the weakness of the body. This is why strength and weakness of body do not have two separate self natures.

26. The three kinds of cessation (*nirodha*), i.e., cessation by means of discriminative knowledge (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*), cessation without discriminative knowledge (*apratisaṃkhyānirodha*) and cessation due to impermanence (*anityānirodha*) are all non-composites (*saṃskṛta*).

27. There are three kinds of extinctions (*nirvāṇa*): the first is invariably of those in training (*śaikṣa*), the second is invariably of those beyond training (*aśaikṣa*), the third is invariably neither training nor beyond training (*nevaśaikṣanāśaikṣa*).[935]

28. The extinction (*nirvāṇa*) that was previously neither training nor beyond training later becomes training. The one that was previously training later becomes beyond training. The one that previously was beyond training later becomes training.[936] <176>

29) The characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of the composites (*saṃskṛta*) are all non-composite.[937]

If the substance (*dravya*) of the characteristics of the composites were composite, its nature (*bhāva*) would be weak and it could not then give rise to things, make them last, transform them and stop them. It is because the substance of the characteristics of the composites is non-composite that, its nature being very powerful, can give rise to things, make them last, transform them and stop them.

30. Holding virtues and rituals in high esteem (*śīlavrataparāmarśa*) and doubt (*vicikitsā)* are bad in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) and indeterminate (*avyākṛta*) in the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) and the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*).[938]

If a thing (*dharma*) is shameless (*hrī*) and unscrupulous (*apatrāpya*) and if its self nature (*svabhāva*) is associated (*saṃprayukta*) with shamelessness and unscrupulousness, this shamelessness and unscrupulousness which produce the fruit of stream-enterer (*srotāpannanaphala*) is bad. As the afflictions (*kleśa*) in the form and the formless realms are not like this, they are thus indeterminate.

---

933 Ibid., P. 90a. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 153 seq.
934 Ibid., p. 154b.
935 Ibid., p. 169a. Lengthy discussion impossible to summarize here.
936 Ibid., p. 169a. Discussion too long to summarize here.
937 Ibid., pp. 198a, 977bc.
938 Ibid., p. 260b.

31. Things (*dharma*) are included in the nature of others (*parabhāva*) but are not included in their own nature (*svabhāva*).[939]

It is said in a Sūtra: "Among the five faculties (*indriya*), the faulty of wisdom (*prajñendriya*) is the best." The faculty of wisdom can include the other faculties, but it is different from them. Several other analogous Sūtras are cited in support of this thesis.

32. The four fruits of the religious life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*) are only non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*).[940]

It is said in a Sūtra that the four fruits are the definitive abandoning of the various bonds (*saṃyojana*). Consequently, the four fruits are non-composite.

33. The substance (*dravya*) of time (*kāla*) is different from that of the composites (*saṃskāra*).[941]

The substance of the composites is impermanent (*anityā).* The substance of time is permanent (*nitya*). The impermanent composites function in permanent time.

34. Supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) manifest in continuity (*saṃtati*) and are not instantaneous (*ekacittakṣaṇika*).[942]

In all, there are three kinds of continuity: the continuity of time (*kālasaṃtati*), the continuity of production (*utpādasaṃtati*) and the continuity of identity (*samasaṃtati*). Although supreme worldly dharmas are not concerned with the first two, they are concerned with the last one.

35. The two bonds (*saṃyojana*) of envy (*īrṣyā)* and egotism (*matsara*) also exist in the world of Brahma (*brahmaloka*).[943]

This thesis rests on a Sūtra in which Devarāja Mahābrahma says to the Brahma gods: "We have no need to go there where the monk Gautama dwells in order to pay homage to him and listen to the Dharma, but we dwell here <177> and it will happen that you will be saved from birth, old age and death and that you will realize cessation and eternal peace." By saying this, king Brahma's mind was bound by the bonds of envy and egotism.

36. The non-defiled (*akliṣṭa*) mind (*citta*) also ensures the continuity of existences (*bhava*).[944]

Actually, the Bodhisattva enters into his mother's womb with right knowledge (*samyagjñāna*) and he abides there with right knowledge. Consequently, he was conceived with an undefiled mind, and this undefiled mind ensures the continuity of his existences.

37. The srotāpanna and the sakṛdāgāmin also obtain the fundamental absorptions (*maulasamāpatti*).[945]

It is said in a Sūtra: "There is no wisdom (*prajñā*) without meditation (*dhyāna*), and there is no meditation without wisdom. Those who have them both go to nirvāṇa and are not far away from it." Not being without wisdom, the srotāpanna and the sakṛdāgāmin thus possess the fundamental absorptions.

---

939 Ibid., pp. 306b, 844b. Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, I, pp. 33-34.
940 T. S. 1545, p. 312c, 336c-337a.
941 Ibid., p. 393a and 700a.
942 Ibid., p. 20b.
943 Ibid., p. 271b.
944 Ibid., pp. 308c, 309a.
945 Ibid., p. 693bc.

38. The latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are the seeds (*bīja*) of the manifestly active afflictions, the outbursts (*paryavasthāna*). The outbursts arise from the latent tendencies.[946]

39. The self nature of the latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) is dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[947]

40. The self nature (*svabhāva*) of the outbursts (*paryavasthāna*) is associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).[948]

41. There is a consciousness member of existence (*bhavaṇgavijñāna*), the cause (*hetu*) of existence.[949]

This consciousness member of existence is identical with that accepted by the Theravādins and it constitutes a prefiguration of the receptacle-consciousness *(ālayavijñāna*) of the Mahāyāna.

The study of the agreements and disagreements of the Vibhajyavādins of the Vibhāṣā from the other sects gives the following results:[950]

Sects	Agree	Disagree
Mahāsāṇghika	16	0
Mahīśāsaka	10	0
Dārṣṭāntika	6	0
Śāriputrābhidharma	11	5
Theravādin	5	15
Andhaka	8	3
Pūrvaśaila	2	2
Vātsīputrīya	3	3
Sammatīya	1	5
Sarvāstivādin	0	40

What should be considered above all in view of our ignorance concerning the doctrine of most of the sets are less the numbers themselves than the relationship between the agreements and the disagreements. The agreement with the Mahāsāṇghikas[951] is quite remarkable. We should not forget the partial agreement with the *Śāriputrīyābhidharma*, the Dārṣṭāntikas and the Andhakas. <178>

Let us examine the hypothesis that both Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra suggest: Are the Vibhajyavādins the Kāśyapīyas? The examination that we have just made has shown that the Vibhajyavādins are closely related, from the viewpoint of doctrine, with the Mahāsaṇghikas on the one hand and with the Mahīśāsakas

[946] Ibid., p. 313a.
[947] Ibid., p. 313a.
[948] Ibid., p. 313a.
[949] L. V. P.: *Siddhi*, p. 179.
[950] Our ignorance of the majority of the theses of many of the sects clearly distorts the numbers which should be considered as minimums, in both columns.
[951] T. Kimura has already noted the colse relationship between the Vibhajyavādins and the Mahāsāṇghikas. Cf. Demiéville*: Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 49, note.

and Dharmaguptakas on the other hand. But the combined evidence of Vasumitra, Bhavya and the *Śāriputrīyābhidharma* tends to prove that the doctrine of the Kāśyapīyas, which was very close to that of the Dharmaguptakas, should also be related, like the latter, to that of the Mahāsāṃghikas. That therefore confirms the accounts of Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra and Vinītadeva: The Kāśyapīyas were Vibhajyavādins.

But were the Kāśyapīyas the only Vibhajyavādins? In contrast to the three aforementioned authors of whom the first two were certainly very well informed, the authors of the *Vibhāṣā* do not attribute to the Vibhajyvādins any thesis in addition which might be given as belonging to the Kāśyapīyas. Better yet, they nominally attribute to the Kāśyapīyas alone several times the fundamental thesis of the latter on ontology.[952] As a result, the authors of the *Vibhāṣā* distinguish the Kāśyapīyas from the Vibhājyavādins and if, for them, the Kāśyapīyas are the Vibhajyavādins, they are certainly not the only Vibhajyavādins.

The *Vibhāṣā* in the same way distinguishes the latter from the Mahāsāṃghikas, the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas, the Dārṣṭāntikas and the Vātsīputrīyas, who all are named there several times. Furthermore, the same theses are attributed sometimes conjontly to the Vibhajyavādins *and* to the Dārṣṭāntikas (4 times), or to the Mahāsāṇghikas (1 time), or to the Vātsīputrīyas (1 time), which seems to prove that, in the mind of the authors of the *Vibhāṣā*, the Vibhajyavādins were distinct and external to these three sects. In two other cases, the *Vibhāṣā* attributes different theses to the Dharmaguptakas and the Vibhajyavādins, which also seems to prove that the Vibhajyavādins were distinct from the Dharmaguptakas, at least that it should not be understood that the Djharmaguptakas maintained opinions in these two cases different from those of the *other* Vibhajyavādins. This last hypothesis is the more plausible in that, in both cases, the opinions ascribed to the Dharmaguptakas and the Vibhajyavādins show the close links between the two sects.

Can we conclude that the heretics designated by the name Vibhajyavādins in the *Vibhāṣā* are indeed the group of Kāśyapīyas, Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas and related schools? Nothing actually opposes this, but there remains a hesitation still. Actually, the *Vibhāṣā* denounces about a dozen times, without ever naming those who uphold it, the ontological thesis of the early Mahīśāsakas, Theravādins, Mahāsāṇghikas and Sautrāntikas: "The past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) have no real existence,"[953] but this thesis is always linked to the next with which it forms an indissoluble whole: "The present (*pratyutpanna*) is non-composite (*asaṃskṛṭa*)."[62] Yet this second portion of the thesis is completely unknown elsewhere. Actually, here is what, according to the four translations of Vasumitra, the second part of the ontological thesis of the Mahīśāsaka says: "The present *and* the non-composite exist"; and, according to Bhavya: "The state of present composite (*saṃskṛta*) exists." Neither in the numerous passages of the two Chinese translations of the *Vibhḥaṣā* nor in the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the treatises of Vasumitra and of Bhavya does

[952] T. S. 1545, pp. 96b, 263c, 741b. T. S. 1546, p. 204c.
[953] T. S. 1545, pp. 65b, 74b, 85b, 190a, 919abc, etc. T. S. 1546, pp. 75c, 142c, 293c, etc.

one find the least indication that would lead one to suspect an error in one or the other.[954] Furthermore, the commentaries made by both sides leave no doubt, <179> if any could exist, about the exact meaning of the two theses. Is it a matter of two expressions of the same thesis? We do not know. If there is no disagreement between these two theses, no further agreement is necessary. It is thus not possible to know with certainty if they were both upheld by the same scholars. We may notice as well that the form given by the *Vibhāṣā,* "The present is non-composite" is closely linked to thesis 33 of the Vibhajyavādins: "Time, which is permanent, is different from the composites, which are impermanent." In fact, the non-composite is always considered as permanent and absolute. The thesis of unknown origin may therefore be enunciated thus: "The present is permanent", which is identical to thesis 33 of the Vibhajyavādins. This thesis of time or the present, eternal and immutable, in which the composites move and are transformed, is contradictory to the thesis of the Sarvāstivāda, which the *Vibhāṣā* has indeed seen and has refuted. As a result, the thesis of unknown origin and thesis 33 of the Vibhajyavādins both follow from the same conception of absolute and inert time, in contrast to the tripartite and essentially functional time of the Sarvāstivādins. Besides, if the Dārṣṭāntikas are indeed the Sautrāntikas as everything leads one to believe, they should maintain, like the latter, that the past and the future do not exist (thesis 19) and, as they are in agreement with the Vibhajyavādins in affirming that time is permanent and thus absolute and distinct from the aggregates, this constitutes a supplementary proof of the close relationship between the two sects in question. The thesis of unknown origin is thus a Vibhajyavādin thesis and it is closely linked, by its first part, to the ontological thesis of the Mahīśāsakas.[955]

But the result is that the Vibhajyavādins of the *Vibhāṣā* are in complete disagreement with the Kāśyapīyas, thus with the Vibhajyavādins of Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra and Vinītadeva, therefore they must consequently be considered as distinct. As it is impossible that either the authors of the *Vibhāṣā* or Vasubandhu and his more orthodox antagonist, Saṃghabhadra, both great scholars whose erudition is reflected in their works, could either one or the other be mistaken, thus it is certain that both did not designate a precise sect by the name of Vibhajyavādin but rather a group of sects. Besides, how would the

---

[954] Besides, Hiuan-tsang has translated both the *Vibhḥāṣā* and Vasumitra's treatise.

[955] If this theory is not that of the Mahīśāsaskas, it has not at least been upheld by a sect of that school or by a related sect. However, the latter could be neither that of the Kāśyapīyas nor that of the Theravādins whose positions in regard to the problem of ontology are well known and completely different. Neither would it seem that this theory was that of the Dharmaguptakas, for the *Śāriputrābhidharma* is silent on the question of ontology. There remains thus the Tāmraśātiyas of whom we know nothing, and the Mahīśāsakas, or rather a school somewhat dissident to these last two, which remains unknown to us. Or else this theory is that of the Mahīśasakas of a certain era, that in which the Vibhḥāṣā was written, around 200 C.E., for it is indeed in the lineage of evolution of the ontological thesis of the early Mahīśāsakas as Vasumitra and Bhavya have transmitted it to us. We may also note that according to these two authors, the Mahāsānghikas, like the Mahīśāsakas, denied the existence of the past and the future. As a result, the Vibhajyavādins, the Mahīśāsakas, the Theravādins, the Sautrāntikas and the Dārṣṭāntikas taught the same ontological doctrine: the past and the future do not exist.

But a mystery remains: why this thesis, denounced a dozen times in the *Vibhāṣā,* remains anonymous whereas, as we know, it was upheld by the Mahīśāsakas, the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Sautrāntikas and the Vibhjyavādins who are often named in other places? Were the authors of the *Vibhāṣā* ignorant that these sects taught this ontological thesis? It is not very likely that their erudition, so vast, would have failed on this major point. We can only be lost in conjecture on the causes of this strange silence.

Vibhāṣā attribute 40 theses to these Vibhajyavādins almost unknown elsewhere, whereas it indicates by name only 6 theses of the Mahāsāṇghikas, 1 of the Mahīśāsakas, 4 of the Dharmaguptakas and 11 of the Vātsīptrīyas, all sects whose importance is undeniable. Someone may object that it attributes twice as many to the Dārṣṭāntikas; but in this case it was a matter <180> of 'a family quarrel', the Dārṣṭāntikas seeming to have come directly from the Sarvāstivādins after a short interval of time.

It may also be objected that the *Vibhāṣā* attributes three completely Lokottarvādin theses to the Vibhajyāvādins (theses 2, 12 and 13). This would effectively be a decisive obstacle if thesis 2, the most characteristic of the three, were not attributed to the Vibhajyavādins *and* to the Mahāsāṇghikas. This has great importance here; it proves on the one hand that the authors of the *Vibhāṣā* clearly distinguished the Vibhajyavādins from the Mahāsāṇghikas, and on the other hand, that the influence of the second on the first was extremely strong.[956] Nothing further opposes the attribution to the Vibhajyavādins of the other two Lokottaravādin theses and, *a fortiori*, of the other thirteen Mahāsāṇghika theses which were also upheld by the Mahīśāsakas or the Dharmaguptakas.

The Sarvāstivādins (authors of the *Vibhāṣā*, Vasubandhu, Saṃghabhadra) are thus in agreement with the Mahāsāṇghikas and the Sammatīyas cited by Bhavya and undoubtedly also with the Theravādins in designating by the name of Vibhajyavādin the group of Sthaviras not Vatsīputrīya, who opposed the Sarvāstivāda, i.e., the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas, the Kāśyapīyas, the Tāmraśātīyas, not to forget the Theravādins themselves. This does not mean that all the sects thus defined accepted all the theses attributed to the Vibhajyavādins *en bloc*. In contrast to Buddhaghosa, the authors unfortunately never specify; *some* Vibhajyvādins, or *some* Mahāsāṇghikas. This omission is too systematic for us not to consider this correction as possible everywhere.

On the purely documentary level, here are the theses attributed by Vinītadeva to the Vibhajyavādins:

1. The individual (*pudgala*) exists in the absolute sense (*paramārtha*).

This is the fundamental and characteristic thesis of the group of the Vātsīputrīyas.

2. That which is past (*atīta*) and does not belong to dharmas the fruit (*phala*) of which has not yet ripened, does not exist. The future (*anāgata*) other than the fruit [which has not yet ripened] does not exist.

This is the fundamental and characteristic thesis of the Kāśyapīyas.

3. The present (*pratyutpanna*) which is not of the same class does not exist.

The meaning of this thesis is obscure.

4. Dharmas do not become immediately preceding causes (*samanantarahetu*).[957]

5. There is no homogeneous cause (*sabhāgahetu*) of matter (*rūpa*).

This is evidently thesis 1 of the Dārṣṭāntikas.

Finally, we may add that, according to Tāranātha, the Vibhajyavādins and the Kāśyapīyas had disappeared by the 7th century.[958]<181>

[956] Kimura has already noted this. See Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 49, note.
[957] Cf. L. V. P.: *Kośa*, II, pp. 300-306.

CHAPTER XXV

The Mahīśasakas

All our sources agree in considering the Mahīśāsakas as the main sect branching off from the trunk of the Sthaviras after the successive schisms of the Haimavatas, Vātsīputrīyas and Sarvāstivādins. If, in agreeing therein with the Sammatīya and the Mahāsāṇghika traditions cited by Bhavya and also, it seems, with the Ceylonese tradition, we designate under the name Vibhajyavādin the Sthaviras who refused to accept the doctrine of the Sarvāstivādins, the Mahīśāsakas make up the most important sect of this group.

According to the orthography and the translations, their name may be interpreted variously as 'those who govern, instruct or correct the earth (*mahīśāsaka*), those who instruct a lot (*mahāśāsaka*), those who eat buffalo meat (Pāli, *mahisāsaka*), the great ones who must not be abandoned (*mahāśeṣya*), the great archers (*maheṣvāsaka*)'. Bhavya (1st list) explains their name thus: "Ruling (*śāsanat*) according to the teachings (*anuśāsana*) [that have come from the sound of the word 'happiness of the earth' (*mahībhadra*) and teaching (*anuśāsanat*) the non-origination (*anutpāda*) of existence (*bhava*) to a great multitude of beings (*sattva*), they are called Mahīśāsaka." K'ouei-ki gives another explanation: "The founding teacher of this sects was the king of a country who ruled (*aśāt*) the territory (*mahī*) of a kingdom. As he ruled the populace of this territory, he was called ruler of the earth (*mahīṣāsaka*). He abandoned his kingdom and went forth from home to spread the Buddha's Dharma everywhere. Hence the name of the Mahīśāsaka sect. Paramārtha calls it the sect of the correctors of the earth (*mahīśāsaka*), the origin of which was a teacher who was a king who corrected and directed a territory. He abandoned the latter and spread the Dharma; this is why he was called the corrector of the earth."[959] Paramārtha also says that the founder of the Mahīśāsaka sect was a converted Brahmin who adorned the Buddhist texts by using the Vedic style and the Sanskrit grammar.[960] Przyluski has attempted to explain their name by comparing it to that of the *Mahīṣamaṇḍala*, 'land of the buffaloes', a region of Mahiṣmatī, Maheshwar today, on the Narbadā.[961] Although his identification of the Mahīśāsakas with the Mahāvantakas rests on a mistake of the Chinese *Mahāvyutpatti*, as we have seen,[962] his hypothesis has some recognized facts: the presence of the Mahīśāsakas in the Dekkan, at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Vanavāsī is attested by an inscription,[963] and their presence in Ceylon by the fact that it was in this island that Fa-hien found their *Vinayapiṭaka*.[964] It is very <182> likely that the Mahīśāsakas lived in the Narbadā basin slightly after the schism of the Sarvāstivādins which gave birth to

[958] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 175.

Chapter XXV
[959] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 7b.
[960] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p.23.
[961] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 322-325.
[962] See above, 1st part, chap. 1.
[963] H. Sastri: *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XX, 1929-20, p. 25.
[964] Legge: *A record of buddhistic kingdoms*, p. 111.

them, i.e., under the reign of Aśoka, and jointly with the Theravādins from whom they were not yet differentiated. As Przyluski notes, it is possible that their name is derived from the geographical term Mahiṣamaṇḍala designating this area and that the word Mahīśāsaka is a noble name re-invented on a poor interpretation of the Prākrit name of the first Mahīśāsakas.

There is little information on the areas in which they lived. An inscription at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, dated in the 11th year of king Vāseṭhīputra Siri-Ehuvala, of the Ikṣvaku dynasty (3rd century of our era) records a donation made by the queen of Vanavāsī to the teachers of the Mahīśāsaka sect.[965] Fa-hien, about 412, found their *Vinayapiṭaka* in Ceylon. An inscription at Kura, south of Takṣaśilā, dated in the reign of Mahārāja Toramāṇa Shāhi Jaūvla (about 490) mentions a gift made to the Maīśāsakas.[966] In 630, Hiuan-tsang found in Uḍḍiyāna some Mahāyāna monks who still taught their *Vinayapiṭaka* in conjunction with those of the Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsāṇghikas,[967] but nowhere else in India did he note their presence. In the last quarter of the 7th century, I-tsing stated that the Mahiṣāsakas were no longer to be found in India proper or Ceylon, but that there were still some groups in Uḍḍiyāṇa (certainly those whom Hiuan-tsang noted), in Karachar, Khotan, the Sonde islands and in southern China.[968]

Two late Sūtras give evidence of the existence in the north-west of India, no doubt more precisely in Uḍḍiyāṇa, of a community in which the five sects, the Mahāśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, Sarvāstivādins and Mahāsāṇghiaks, lived in complete harmony. According to these works, the Mahīśāsakas were distinguished by their blue garments and their talent in penetrating the subtleties of meditation (*dhyāna*) by pursuing the abstract and obscure.[969] According to another late Sūtra, the Mahīśāsakas did not form the ideas (*saṃjñā)* of earth (*pṛthivī*), water (*apas*), fire (*tejas*), wind *(vāyu*), space *(ākāśa*) and consciousness (*vijñāna*).[970]

Of their literature, only the *Vinayapiṭaka* has come down to us in a Chinese translation.[971] This work is very close to the Pāli *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Theravavādins, which attests to the close relationship of the two sects.[972] Their *Vinayapiṭaka* mentions a *Sutrapiṭaka* made up of five *Āgamas*, *Dirgha, Madhyama, Saṃyukta, Ekottara* and *Kṣudraka*, but which makes no mention anywhere of the existence of an *Abhidharmapiṭaka,* as a careful study reveals.[973] The two lone passages where the word Abhidharma appears concern the discipline of this name and not the canonical work dedicated to it. On the other hand, it mentions several times the Vinaya and the Dharma jointly, i.e., the Sūtras.[974] It is therefore certain that the

[965] H.Sastri: *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XX, 1929-30. p. 25.
[966] *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. I, p. 238 seq.
[967] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, p. 226.
[968] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. XXIV and 7 seq.
[969] T.S. 1465, p. 900c; T.S. 1470, p. 926a. Lin Ki Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi,* p. 80-81.
[970] T.S. 397, p. 26b. Lin Li Kouang: Op. cit, p. 300.
[971] T.S. 1421 and 1433, translated by Buddhajīva in 424.
[972] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 315, 316, 322, 330 340 363; Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśālī*, p 167, 190, 192,193, 194, 238, 240, 250.
[973] Przyluski: Op. cit., p. 147, 148; T.S. 1421, p. 191a.
[974] Ibid., p. 139 and 159.

Mahiśāsaka *Vinayapiṭaka* had definitely been completed before their *Abhidharmapiṭaka* was written and incorporated into the Canon, if it existed at all. This absence <183> of an *Abhidharmapiṭa*ka in which the doctrine of the sect should have been set down, explains the big differences that Vasumitra notes between the doctrines of the two successive schools of the Mahīśāsakas as well as the differences that seem to have existed between the southern school known to Buddhaghosa and the northern school known to Vasunitra.

If, as is probable, the Mahīśāsakas and the Theravādins constituted a single sect at the beginning, that of the Vibhajyavādins, we must confess that we know that the doctrine of the former is somewhat different from that of the latter. The latter seems more archaic, which may be explained by the relative insular isolation of the Theravādins about the 2nd century before our era. It seems that the Theravādins were the portion of the Vibhajyavādins who lived in Ceylon from the end of the 3rd century or the beginning of the 2nd century C.E., and the Mahīśāsakas were those who lived on the Indian sub-continent and whose doctrine changed more quickly.

Here are the theses of the Mahīśāsakas:

1. The past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) do not exist. The present (*pratyutpanna*) and the unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*) exist.[975]

2. There is clear realization (*abhisamaya*) of the four noble Truths *(āryasatya*) at a single time. When one sees the Truth of suffering (*duḥkhasatya*), one can see all the Truths.[976]
When, by the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*), one realizes clearly the general aspects *(ākāra*) of emptiness (*śūnyatā)* and selflessness (*anātmya*), one penetrates the four Truths by this understanding. If one has clearly and distinctly understood the general aspects of the four Truths, when one sees the truth of suffering in the Path of cultivation (*bhāvanāmārga*), one is able to clearly understand the other three Truths. Similarly just as the mental consciousness (*manovijñana*) alone is able to take as object the five aggregates (*skandha*) and the ten material (*rūpin*) spheres *(āyatana*) and, at one single time, know them distinctly, so one is able, by means of the Path which is not that of seeing, to see the principles of the Truths which one has already clearly understood together.

3. The tendencies (*anuśaya*) are neither mind (*citta*) nor mental events (*caitta*) nor without object *(ālambana*). Their self-nature is dissociated from mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[977]

4. The tendencies (*anuśaya*) are different from the manifestly active afflictions (*paryavasthāna*). The self-nature of the active afflictions is associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).[978]

5. Worldly people (*pṛthagjana*) cannot abandon either the passion of lust (*kāmarāga*) or malice (*vyāpāda*).[979]

6. No heretic (*tīrthika*) is able to acquire the five superknowledges (*abhijñā*).[980]

---

[975] Vasunitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 1; Vinītadeva, thesis 1: neither the past nor the future nor the present (This certainly a mistake). See above thesis 7 of the Theravādins.
[976] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Bhavya, thesis 2; Vinītadeva thesis 2.
[977] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Vinītadeva, thesis 7.
[978] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Bhavya, thesis 3.
[979] Vasumitra, thesis 4; Vinītadeva, thesis 3; Bhavya, thesis 10, says the opposite, certainly in error.

Because of their wrong (*mithyā)* doctrine (*deśanā),* heretics cannot acquire the five superknowledges. Although some can fly in the sky and accomplish other miracles, it is only by utilizing the power of magical spells, drugs or the spirits.

7. There is no pure conduct (*brahmacaryā*) among the Gods (*deva*).[981] <184>

The reason for this is that the Gods enjoy many pleasures, especially the sense pleasures.

8. There is no intermediary existence (*antarābhava*).[982]

9. In the Arhants also there is accumulation of merit (*puṇyopacaya*).[983]

10. The five sense consciousnesses (*vijñana*) are both provided with passions (*sarāga*) and deprived of passions (*virāga*).[984]

That the five consciousnesses are provided with passions goes without saying since it is through their intermediary that the passions enchain beings. But the sense consciousnesses also permit one to see the Buddha, to hear his Dharma, etc., which allows the being to enter into the holy Path and to cultivate it. Consequently, the five sense consciousnesses are both with and without passions.

11. The six consciousnesses (*vijñana*) are associated (*saṃprayukta*) with examination (*vitarka*) and analysis (*vicāra*).[985]

12. There is an individual (*pudgala*) "of the same head" (*samaśīrṣin*) also.[986]

The individual "of the same head" is a Non-returner (*anāgamin*). He is reborn on the highest level (*bhūmi*) [the realm of neither perception nor non-perception (*nevasaṃjñānāsaṃjñayatana*)], and cannot produce the pure (*anāsrava*) noble Path *(āryamārga*) [of the levels] lower than that. Here he takes the Fruit of No-more-learning (*aśaikṣaphala*), [i.e., that of Arhant] and when he arrives at the desired end of his life, all his fetters (*saṃyojana*) are exhausted by themselves, he becomes Arhant and attains complete extinction (*parinirvāṇa*). He is called "with the same head" because of the head [the culmination, the final end] of his births and deaths [because he comes to his final death and deliverance at the same time]. Being on the final stage, he arrives at the supreme realm *(āyatana*) then at the realm of non-production (*anutpanna*) even though he does not produce the noble Path, and he attains the Fruit of the sage.[987]

13. There is no worldly *(laukika*) faculty of faith (*śraddendriya*).[988]

There is no faculty of faith that is worldly, for worldly faith is not steady, it changes and does not increase. Therefore it cannot be called a sovereign faculty (*indriya*).

14. There is no supramundane (*lokottara*) meditation (*dhyāna*).[989]

---

[980] Vasumitra, thesis 5.
[981] Vasumitra, thesis 6; Vinītadeva, thesis 4; Bhavya thesis 5, says the opposite.
[982] Vasunitra, thesis 7; Bhavya, thesis 4; Vinītadeva, thesis 5.
[983] Bhavya, thesis 6; Vinītadeva, thesis 6; Vasumitra, thesis 8, says the opposite.
[984] Vasumitra, thesis 9; Bhavya, thesis 7.
[985] Vasumitra, thesis 10. K'ouei-ki does not comment on this thesis. See *Vibhaṇga*, chap. III, 3, for the Theravādins, and L.V.P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 59-60 and 173-176 fro the Sarvāstvādins.
[986] Vasumitra, thesis 11; Bhavya, thesis 8.
[987] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 33b.
[988] Vasumitra, thesis 12. Kathāvatthu, XIX, 8. The Tibetan and the Chinese versions of Hiuan-tsang add: There is a worldly right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*). The other two Chinese versions say the opposite.
[989] Vasumitra, thesis 13.

The meditations are coarse (*sthūla*). Heretics (*tīrthika*) and worldly people (*pṛthagjana*) can attain them completely. Meditations that are impure (*sāsrava*), absorptions (*samāpatti*) that are pure (*anāsrava*) and those by means of which one enters into the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*) should be distinguished.

15. There is no pure (*anāsrava*) examination (*vitarka*) or reflection (*vicāra*).[990]

Examination being coarse (*sthūla*) is impure (*sāsrava*) only. Reflection is subtle (*sūkṣma*) and penetrates the eight members (*aṇga*) of the pure Path (*mārga*). But right reflection is just an impure auxiliary <185> of the members of the Path. It is called a member of the Path but really it is not.

16. The good (*kuśala*) is not a cause of existence (*bhavahetu*).[991]

The good is not an efficient and correct cause of births and deaths. Although it helps bad (*akuśala*) actions (*karman*) in causing humans and gods to transmigrate, it is an established principle that a correct cause can ripen only in the three kinds of existence (*bhava*). If one is reborn in the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*) and the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*), it is because the influence of bad and subtle actions has been aided by the good, for bad actions penetrate into the realm of form and the formless realm.[992]

17. The Stream-enterer (*srotāpanna*) regresses (*parihāṇi*). The Arhant certainly does not have regression.[993]

The Stram-enterer can regress since he has just attained the Path and he still has delusion (*moha*). The Arhant cannot regress since for him the Path is completed.

18. The members of the Path (*mārgāṇga*) are all included (*saṃgṛhita*) in the foundations of mindfulness (*smṛtupasthāna*).[994]

Being associated with wisdom (*prajñasaṃprayukta*), the foundations of mindfulness are mental things (*caitta*) like the members of the Path.

19. There are nine kinds of unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*) things: 1) cessation by means of discriminating consciousness (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*); 2) cessation without discriminating consciousness (*apratisaṃkhyānirodha*); 3) space *(ākāśa*); 4) stillness *(āneñjya*); 5) the suchness of good things (*kuśaladharmatathatā);* 6) the suchness of bad things (*akuśaladharmatathatā);* 7) the suchness of indeterminate things (*avyākṛtatathatā);* 8) the suchness of the Path (*mārgatathatā);* 9) the suchness of dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpādatathatā).*[995]

20. From conception up to death, the great elements (*mahābhūta*), the faculties (*indriya*), the mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) change.

In the interval of time between conception and death, the mind and mental events, the faculties and the great elements change in the same way that milk (*kṣīra*) changes into curdled milk (*dadhi*). Since their

[990] Vasumitra, thesis 13.
[991] Vasumitra, thesis 14.
[992] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 35ab.
[993] Vasumitra, thesis 15.
[994] Vasumitra, thesis 16.
[995] Vasumitra, thesis 17; Vinītadeva, thesis 8. *Kathāvatthu*, II, 11; VI, 2 and 6.

nature (*bhāva*) is not born and does not die momentarily (*kṣaṇa*), there is transformation. All the conditioned factors (*saṃskṛta*) are therefore not momentarily destroyed.[996]

21. Because there is the Buddha in the Community (*saṃgha*), generosity (*dāna*) made to the Community procures a great fruit (*mahāphala*), but not the generosity made especially to the Buddha.[997]

The Buddha is in the Saṃgha since he is counted among the monks *(śrāmaṇa*). Having entered nirvāṇa long ago he cannot in any way enjoy the gift made to him and this is why the gift does not produce a great fruit. On the other hand, the gift made to the Saṃgha, which is made up of living people who enjoy the gift, profits it and consequently this gift is very meritorious and produces a great fruit. <186>

22. The Buddhas and the Śrāvakas have the same Path (*mārga*) and the same deliverance (*vimukti*).[998]

Although there are differences between the knowledges (*jñāna*) of the Buddha and those of the Listeners, the substance of the Path does not change when it is followed by the former and the latter, its nature remains the same and it functions the same although to different degrees.

23. The deliverance of the Buddha and that of the Listeners are the same as the cessation by means of discriminating awareness (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*).

All conditioned things (*saṃskṛta*) are completely destroyed each moment (*kṣaṇikaniruddha*) and have no duration (*sthiti*).[999]

24. Neither the mind (*citta*) nor the mental events (*caitta*) nor anything (*dharma*) whatsoever transmigrates (*saṃkrānti*) from this world (*asmāllokāt*) into another world (*paraṃ lokaṃ*).[1000]

Since everything is instantaneously destroyed (*kṣaṇikaniruddha*), it cannot transmigrate.

25. The mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) are able to cognize themselves mutually.[1001]

There are two kinds of wisdom (*prajnā)* that arise at the same time: the one is associated with the mind (*citta-saṃprayukta*), the other is dissociated from the mind (*citta-viprayukta*). The first cognizes the second and vice versa.

26. The form (*rūpa*) of the one who is endowed with the Path (*maggasamaṇī*) is Path (*magga*).[1002]

Since right speech (*sammāvācā),* right conduct (*sammākammanta*) and right livelihood (*sammājīva*), which are form, are part of the Path, the form of the one who is provided with the Path is therefore Path.

27. Form (*rūpa*) is good (*kusala*) or bad (*akusala*).[1003]

Physical action (*kāyakamma*) and vocal action (*vacīkamma*) are good or bad. Conseqently, the form of information by the body (*kāyaviññatti*) and information by the voice (*vacīviññati*), which is considered to be part of the physical and vocal actions, is good or bad.

---

[996] K'oujei-ki, III, p. 37a. But see below thesis 23.
[997] Vasumitra, thesis 19; Bhavya, thesis 11; Vinītadeva, thesis 9. T.S. 1646, p. 258c.
[998] Vasumitra, thesis 20.Bhavya, thesis 12; Vinītadeva, thesis 10.
[999] Vasumitra, thesis 21; Bhavya, theses 15 and 17.
[999] Vasumitra, thesis 22; Bhavya, thesis 14.

[1001]Vibhāṣā, T.S. 1545, p. 42c.
[1002] *Kathāvatthu*, X, 1.
[1003] Ibid., XVI, 7.

28. Form (*rūpa*) is action (*kamma*). Physical action (*kāyakamma*) originating (*samuṭṭhita*) in a good (*kusala*) mind (*citta*) is good form.[1004]

Physical action and vocal action are form considered as information (*viññatti*) by the body (*kāya*) or the speech (*vacī*). If its origin is good (*kusalasamuṭṭhāna*), it is good and if its origin is bad (*akusalasamṭṭāna*), it is bad. This thesis is linked with the preceding one.

29. One goes directly (*saṇkamati*) from one meditation (*jhāna*) to the next meditation.[1005]

The Buddha said: "As soon as he is freed (*vivicceva*) from desires (*kāma*)… having attained (*upasampajja*) the first meditation, the monk abides (*viharati*) therein; by means of the calming (*vūpasama*) of examination (*vitakka*) and <187> reflection (*vicāra*), having attained the second meditation… the third meditation… the fourth meditation, he abides therein." Consequently, one goes directly from one meditation to the next without (*vinā)* the appearance of stages of access (*upacārappavatti*) of one to another.

30. The Path (*magga*) has five members (*pañcaṇgika*).[1006]

Right speech (*sammāvācā),* right conduct (*sammākammanta*) and right livelihood (*sammājīva*) form a separate unity which should not be included in the Path for it is dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*). Therefore there are five members of the Path instead of eight.

31. The Stream-enterer (*srotāpanna*) acquires the trances (*dhyana*).[1007]

32. The individual (*pudgala*) does not see (*na paśyati*).[1008]

33. The action (*karman*) that can increase the formations (*saṃskāra*) is birth (*jāti*).[1009]

34. There is no thing (*dharma*) that cannot be destroyed (*vinaṣṭa*).[1010]

35. Having seen (*dṛṣṭvā)* the conditioned *(saṃskṛta*), one enters into the absence of errors.[1011]

Although this thesis is not accompanied by a commentary, it is easy to understand it. It is a corollary of thesis 2 above. Examination of the conditioned reveals that they are painful (*duḥkha*), empty (*śūnya*), selfless (*anātmaka*) and impermanent (*anitya*). This examination is therefore the same as the Truth of suffering (*duḥkhasatya*) by means of which one enters into the Path (*mārga*) of deliverance (*vimukti*).

36. The supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) are included (*paryāpanna*) in the three worlds (*dhātu*).[1012]

In fact, when on a given level there is (*bhūmi*) cognition of exhaustion (*kṣayajñāna*), a root of good (*kuśalamūla*) which can be developed (*bhāvayitavya*), on this level there are the supreme worldly dharmas.

37. There is an aggregate that lasts until the end of transmigration (*saṃsārakoṭiniṣṭhaskandha*).[1013]

[1004] Ibid., VIII, 9. See also below thesis 5 of the second series.
[1005] Ibid., XVIII, 6.
[1006] Iid., XX, 5.
[1007] Bhavya, thesis 9.
[1008] Bhavya, thesis 13.
[1009] Bhavya, thesis 16. Lacking any commentary, the meaning of this thesis is enigmatic.
[1010] Bhavya, thesis 19. This thesis seems to be a corollary of thesis 23 affirming the instantaneousness of all composites.
[1011] Bhavya, thesis 22.
[1012] *Vibhāṣā,* T.S. 1545, p. 14a; T.S. 1546, p. 9b: this thesis is missing.

This is a prefiguration of the storehouse consciousness *(ālayavijñana*) of the Mahāyāna. According to the Mahīśāsakas, there are three kinds of aggregates: 1) the aggregates that are momentary (*kṣaṇaskadha*), 2) the aggregates that last during a single lifetime (*ekajanmāvadhiskandha*) such as the sense organs (*indriya*), etc., 3) the aggregate that lasts until the end of transmigration.

38. There are beings who stat out *(ādyutpanna*), who are not born from actions (*karman*) and afflictions (*kleśa*). Their first lifetime having passed, they are then born from actions and afflictions. Since many of them are born, the Buddha never becomes exhausted.[1014]

Here are the theses attributed by Vasumitra to the secondary or late Mahīśāsaka school:

1. The past *(atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) truly exist.[1015] <188>

This thesis contradicts thesis 1 above. This is the fundamental thesis of the Sarvāstivādins. It is possible that some Mahīśāsakas became incorporated into the Sarvāstivāda at a time which we cannot specifiy but which must have been about the beginning of our era.

2. There is an intermediary existence (*antarābhava*).[1016]

This thesis contradicts thesis 8 above. Again this is a Sarvāstivādin thesis.

3. The sphere of mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*) is completely cognizable (*jñeya*) and perceptble to the consciousness (*vijñeya*).[1017]

Again this is a Sarvāstivādin thesis.

4. Action (*karman*), in reality, is volition (*cetanā).* There is neither physical action (*kāyakarman*) nor vocal action (*vākkarman*).[1018]

5. Action (*karman*) is in conformity with the mind (*yathācitta*).[1019]

This is a corollary of the preceding thesis.

6. Examination (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) are associated (*saṃprayukta*) with the mind (*citta*).[1020]

This again is a thesis of the Sarvāstivādins.

7. The great element (*mahābhūta*) earth (*pṛthivī*) lasts (*tiṣṭhati*) for a cosmic era (*kalpa*).[1021]

The great element earth lasts for a *kalpa* for it is not instantaneously destroyed (*kṣaṇikaniruddha*). This thesis thus contradicts thesis 23 above.

8. The worship (*pūjā)* of a reliquary (*stūpa*) does not produce any fruit (*phala*) or a small fruit.[1022]

[1013] L.V.P.: *Siddhi*, p. 180.
[1014] Ibid., p. 809.
[1015] Vasumitra, thesis 1 of the second series.
[1016] Vasumitra, thesis 2 of the second series.
[1017] Vasumitra, thesis 3 of the second series.
[1018] Vasumitra, thesis 4 of the second series; Bhavya, thesis 18. See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, IV, p. 2 seq.
[1019] Bhavya, thesis 18.
[1020] Vasumitra, thesis 5 of the second series. Cf. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 59-60 and 173-176.
[1021] Vasumitra, thesis 6 of the seond series.
[1022] Vasumitra, thesis 7 of the seconmd series. Bhavya, thesis 20.

9. The self-nature (*svabhāva*) of the tendencies (*anuśaya*) remains present (*pratyutpanna*) always (*sadā).*[1023]

The self-nature of the tendencies remains in the present always because it makes all things (*dharma*) arise (*utpadyati*). Although it may be past, it does not abandon the present.[1024]

10. The aggregates (*skandha*), the spheres *(āyatana*) and the elements (*dhātu*) are also present (*sadā)* always (*pratyutpanna*).[1025]

Only the seeds (*bīja*) that are constantly present are able to make things (*dharma*) arise (*utpadyanti*). This is why the aggregates, spheres and elements are present always.[1026] This thesis is closely linkd with the preceding one. It seems to be related to the Sarvāstivāda thesis (above, no. 1) adopted by the late Mahīśāsakas.

11. The secondary school of the Mahīśāsakas was split in discussing the interpretation of the following stanza (*gāthā):*

"Five things (*dharma*) can certainly bind one.

All suffering (*duḥkha*) arises from these: <189>

Ignorance (*avidyā),* lust (*kāma*), craving (*tṛṣṇā),*

The five conceptual theories (*drṣṭi)* and actions (*karman*)."

Five things bind beings (*sattva*) and prevent them from coming out of the cycle of birth and death. All suffering arises and is produced by these five things: 1) ignorance (*avidyā),* i.e., the non-knowing of the three worlds (*dhātu*); 2) lust (*kāma*); 3) craving for the world of form (*rūpa*) and the formless (*arūpa*) world; 4) the five conceptual theories (*drṣṭi*), i.e., the theory of the innate self (*satkāyadrṣṭi*), etc. [the view of holding onto the extremes (*antagrāhadṛṣṭi*), wrong views (*mithyādṛṣṭi*), esteeming bad theories (*dṛṣṭiparāmarśa*), esteeming virtue and rituals (*śīlavrataparāmarśa*)];[1027] 5) actions (*karman*), i.e., the three actions (of body (*kāya*), speech (*vac*) and mind (*manas*)..

Why are only these five things named, and how many actions are there?

Because it has been said above [thesis 16] that the good (*kuśala*) is not a cause of existence (*bhavahetu*) and the absence of merit (*puṇya*) does not initiate movement. By means of the Path of seeing (*darśanamārga*), one conquers the five conceptual theories whose obstructive principles appeared first. By means of the Path of development (*bhāvanamārga*), one conquers the lust and craving whose objects appeared first. The principles that reside within the objects of the five conceptual theories are the three realms (*dhātu*) as they are the same in their characteristics of composites (*saṃskṛta*). It is only in order to summarize that we speak of five conceptual theories. The objects of lust and craving also have the characteristics of composites, but each of them is different from the others. The objects of the world of desire (*kāmadhātu*) are the external (*bāhya*) sense gates (*dvāra*), i.e., the five objective domains (*viṣaya*) of the senses. The objects of the two higher realms are the internal *(ādyātmika*) sense gates, i.e., the body

[1023] Vasumitra, thesis 8 of the second series. Bhavya, thesis 21.
[1024] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 40a.
[1025] Vasumitra, thesis 9 of the second series.
[1026] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 40a.
[1027] Vasumitra, thesis 10 of the second series.

(*kāya*). This is why we distinguish lust from craving. Thus these two kinds of Paths (*mārga*), seeing (*darśana*) and development (*bhāvanā),* have different uses. However, even though one uses these two Paths fully to conquer the root (*mūla*), i.e., ignorance (*avidyā),* since [their field of activity] is limited, the other errors (*moha*) are not listed among them. Moreover, ignorance is the member (*aṇga*) of ignorance [in the *pratītyasamutpāda*], lust and craving are the member of craving, the five conceptual theories are member of grasping (*upādāna*). Due to the increase of the latter, action produces the formations (*saṃskāra*) and existence *(bhava*). Because the five things are always able to tether, one obtains consciousness (*vijñāna*), etc., up to birth (*jāti*). Moreover, it is only because of bad actions (*akuśala*) that one is born into the two higher realms, for these bad actions are subtle (*sūkṣma*). Good (*kuśala*) things help them to ripen into superior births. Since there is no maturation due to good actions in the two higher realms, the [bad action] of body, speech and mind are designated by the expression 'actions'.[1028] <190>

[1028] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 40b-41b

CHAPTER XXVI

The Dharmaguptakas

All our sources make the Dharmaguptakas a sect which separated from the Mahīśāsakas during the 3rd century E.N according to the northern sources. From the examination of their theses, it would seem that the origin of the schism concerned the relationships of the Buddha and the Saṃgha and the merits of the respective gifts made to both.

The name Dharmaguptaka means 'he who protects or conserves the Dharma'.[1029] This name was borne by several more or less famous individuals in the history of Buddhism, notably by two translators, the first at the beginning of the 5th century of our era, the other, better known, at the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th centuries,[1030] and by a Ceylonese master whom Fa-hien met in Ceylon at the beginning of the 5th century.[1031] In that case, the sect derived its name from that of its teacher, another Dharmagupta.[1032]

Paramārtha says that the Dharmaguptakas, coming from the Mahīśāsaka sect, had a Canon of four or five Baskets, adding to the classical *Tripiṭaka* a *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* containing the tales of the previous careers of the Bodhisattvas and even, it seems, a *Dhāraṇīpiṭaka* or *Mantrapiṭaka* containing magical phrases. They derived their name from their founder Dharmagupta but they took expressly as their patron-saint the great magician-disciple of the Buddha, Maudgalyāyana, of whom their founder, Dharmagupta, had been the ardent disciple.[1033] Some indications seem to prove that the Dharmaguptakas actually had a special veneration for Maudgalyāyana,[1034] which goes along with the intrusion, at a certain point more or less, of a *Dhāraṇīpiṭaka* into their Canon.

No inscription or evidence from the Chinese pilgrims gives any information about their place in India. In the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang and I-tsing found traces of them in Uḍḍiyāna. The former reports that in this land, five Vinayas, of which that of the Dharmaguptakas was still taught by monks belonging to the Mahāyāna, particularly experts in *dhāraṇī* and *mantra*, who recited their books without understanding the profound meaning.[1035] I-tsing did not meet them in India except in small groups in Uḍḍiyāna and Central Asia and particularly in western and eastern China.[1036]

Chapter XXVI
[1029] S. Lévi and E. Chavannes: *Les seize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi*.
[1030] P.C. Bagchi: *Le Canon bouddhique en Chine*, p. 174-175 and 464-467.
[1031] J. Legge: *A record of Buddhist kingdoms*, p. 107.
[1032] This is the opinion of the Sthaviras cited by Bhavya (1st list) and also of Paramārtha and K'ouei-ki.
[1033] Demiéville: *Origine des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 23, 61 and 62.
[1034] Ibid., p. 61, note.
[1035] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, p. 226.
[1036] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. XXIV, 7 seq.

Basing himself on the fact that different parts of the Dharmaguptaka *Vinayapiṭaka* <191> had been imported into China by Sogdian, Parthian and Kashmirian monks, Przyluski assumes that their domain was in western India.[1037]

Although our knowledge of the Indian domain of the Dharmaguptakas is reduced to hypotheses, fortunately we have a large part of their canonical literature.

Their *Vinayapiṭaka* has transitted to us the structure of their Canon which is a normal *Tripiṭaka* and not, as Paramārtha and K'ouei-ki claim, a Canon of five Baskets. If the latter did exist, it was, rather, composed and adopted only late by the Mahāyānist Dharmaguptaka school. At the early stage, their Canon was composed as follows:[1038]

I. *Vinayapiṭaka*:	1. *Bhikṣupratimokṣa*
	2. *Bhikṣuṇīpratimokṣa*
	3.*Khandhaka*
	4. *Ekottara*
II. *Sūtrapiṭaka*:	1. *Dīrghāgama*
	2. *Madhyamāgama*
	3. *Ekottarāgama*
	4. *Saṃyuktāgama*
	5. *Kṣudrakāgama*
III. *Abhidharmapiṭaka*:	1. *Sapraśnaka* ('with difficulties')
	2. *Apraśnaka* ('without difficulties')
	3. *Saṃgrahasaṃyukta*
	4. *Prasthāna*

The preface to the Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama* briefly describes in the following way a Canon which we have good reason to think is of Dharmaguptaka origin:[1039]

Vinayapiṭaka: 4 sections and 10 recitation texts.

Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharmapiṭaka: 4 sections and 5 recitation texts

Sūtrapiṭaka: *1*) *Ekottarāgama:* 4 sections and 8 recitation texts.

2) Madhyagama: 4 sections and 5 recitations texts;

3) *Saṃyuktāgama*: 4 sections and 10 recitations ,

4) *Dirghāgama*: 4 sections and 4 recitations, 30 sūtras.

[1037] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājaṛha*, p. 326. He cites other evidence: possible identity of Dharmnagupta and Dharnarakṣita who evangelized Aparāntaka and the Sindh, etc.
[1038] T.S. 1428, p. 968b; Przyluski: Concile de Rājagṛha, p. 194-195 and 354.
[1039] T.S. 1, p. 1a; Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 355. This Canon has a *Vinaya* in 4 parts which is characteristic of that of the Dharmaguptakas, which also has 10 recitations. Moreover, the translator of this *Dīrghāgama*, Buddhayaśas, is also the translator of the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*.

What characterizes the Dharmaguptaka *Vinayapiṭaka* is its division into four parts. As we see, it seems that the Dharmaguptakas had the tendency of dividing their Canon according to a division into four sections. This is what particularly distinguishes it from that of the Haimavatas.[1040]

Of this Canon, we have the *Vinayapiṭaka*, translated into Chinese by Buddhayaśas at Tch'ang-Ngan in the first years of the 5th century of our era. We probably also have its *Dirghāgama*, translated by this same Buddhayaśas, and its *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, translated at the same time and at Tch'ang-Ngan by Dharmayaśas and Dharmagupta, which has been preserved for us under the name of *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra*.[1041] <192>

Although the general plan of this Canon is rather different at first sight from that of the Sarvāstivādin Canon or the Theravādin Canon, a careful examination shows that the same portions and the same Sūtras are found in it as in the other two, although arranged differently. As might be expected, great divergences are observed in the comparison of the three *Abhidharmapiṭakas*. The doctrine of that of the Dharmaguptakas is markedly different from that of the other two as we will see.

Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva state their particular opinions on some of big problems of Buddhism:

1. The Buddha is not included *(paryāpanna*) in the Saṃgha. This is why generosity (*dāna*) to the Buddha produces a great fruit (*mahāphala*), but not generosity to the Saṇgha.[1042]

The intrinsic value of the Buddha is greatly superior to that of the Saṇgha. Actually, the latter is provided with a superior (*sottara*) whereas the Buddha is supreme, without superior (*anuttara*). Generosity to the Buddha produces a great fruit, but not generosity to the Saṇgha, by virtue of the rule according to which the merit of a gift is proportional to the value of its recipient. On the other hand, the intention of the gift to the Buddha contains within itself undeniable spiritual benefits by concentrating all of the mind on worship of the Buddha alone.

2. Although the deliverance (*vimukti*) of the Buddha is the same as that of the Listeners (*śrāvaka*), their paths (*mārga*) are different.[1043]

3. The heretics (*tīrthikas*) are unable to attain the five superknowledges (*abhijñā*).[1044]

4. The body (*kāya*) of the Arhant is completely pure (*anāsrava*).[1045]

The body of the Arhant is pure in two senses: 1) his support *(āśraya*) is without impurities *(āsrava*) because the aggregates (*skandha*) of Those of no-more-learning (*aśaikṣa*) produce no further impurities; 2) his sense-objects (*viṣaya*) are without impurities because they neither cause further impurities to arise nor to increase.

5. There is pure conduct (*brahmacārya*) even among the Gods (*deva*).[1046]

[1040] See above, chap. XIV.
[1041] See A. Bareau: *Les origines du Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra*, Muséon, vol. LXIII, 1-2, 1950, p 69-95.
[1042] Vasumitra, thesis 1, says the opposite, except the translation of the Ts'in. But Bhavya, thesis 1, and Vinītadeva, thesis 1, confirm it.
[1043] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 2.
[1044] Vasumitra, thesis 3; Vinītadeva, thesis 3. See thesis 6 of the Mahīśāsakas.
[1045] Vasumitra, thesis 4; Vinītadeva, thesis 4.

6. The worship (*pūjā*) of a reliquary (*stūpa)* produces a very great fruit (*bṛhatphala*).[1047]

The relics (*śarīra*) of the Buddha present in the shrine symbolically represent the Buddha. Besides, the latter said that that there is no difference between the relics and the Buddha himself. He himself said that he accepted the gifts that would be made to the relics. Therefore gifts made to the relics can only produce very great fruit.

7. There are worldly (*laukika*) things (*dharma*).[1048]

This last thesis does not appear to be original, for all the sects recognize two categories of *laukika* dharmas. The first kind are the dharmas subject to the vicissitudes of the worls (*loka*) as opposed to the *lokottara* or supramundane dharmas which are the Path (*mārga*) and the unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*) dharmas. The second kind are the eight dharmas belonging to the world of rebirth, i.e., gain and loss, praise and blame, fame and denigration, good fortune and bad fortune. Perhaps the Dharmaguptakas had <193> a third category of worldly dharmas which were peculiar to them and which we know nothing about.

8. The supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgradharma*) are included (*paryāpanna*) in the three realms (*dhātu*) and not included (*aparyāpanna*) in the three realms.[1049]

Since these things are called worldly (*laukika*), they are thus included in the three realms. On the other hand, since they are called supreme (*agra*), they are not included in the three relams.

9. The mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) can cognize things associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).[1050]

Wisdom (*prajnā)* is able to cognize things associated with the mind.

10. The self-nature (*svabhāva*) of physical strength (*kāyabala*) is energy (*vīrya*). The self-nature of physical weakness is indolence (*kausīdya*).[1051]

11. Three characteristics of the conditioned (*saṃskṛtalakṣaṇa*) are conditioned (*saṃskṛta*). The characteristic of cessation (*nirodhalakṣaṇa*) alone is non-conditioned (*asaṃskṛta*).[1052]

The nature (*bhava*) of the characteristics is impermanent (*anitya*) because the nature of the composites is weak. This is why it cannot make things (*dharma*) cease (*nirundhati*). Because the nature of the latter is unconditioned, it is strong and consequently capable of making things stop.

12. Only by means of the contemplation of the signless (*animittasamādhi*) can one enter into the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment. (*samyaktvaniyāma*).[1053]

13. Interdependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) is non-conditioned (*asaṃskṛta*).[1054]

Finally, Vasumitra notes that their doctrine is very close to that of the Mahīśāsakas, which is at first surprising since the Dharmaguptakas came from the Sthavira group.

[1046] Bhavya, thesis 2.
[1047] Vasumitra, thesis 1 (Hiuan-tsang's and Paramārtha's translations).
[1048] Bhavya, thesis 3.
[1049] T.S. 1545, p. 14a; T.S. 1546, p. 9b.
[1050] Ibid., p. 42c.
[1051] Ibid., p. 154 bc.
[1052] Ibid., p. 198a.
[1053] Ibid., p. 927c.
[1054] T.S. 1566, p. 62a; T.S. 1567, p. 136a.

The study of the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra* is particularly interesting because its doctrine is very different from that of the *Abhidharmapiṭakas* of the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādins and, on the other hand, very close to that of the Mahāsāṅghikas, Mahīśāsakas and Vibhajyavādins. Here are its more interesting theses:

1. The individual (*pudgala*) is merely a designation (*prajñapti*).[1055] The individual consists of eyes (*cakṣus*), ears (*śrota*), nose (*ghrāna*), tongue (*jihva*), body (*kāya*) and mind (*manas*) which are designated [together as] the individual.

The eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body and mind are not the individual. Outside of the eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body and mind, there is no further person. It is the same for a house which consists of beams, rafters, partitions and walls which are designated [together as] a house. The beams, rafters, partitions and walls are not <194> the house. Outside of the beams, rafters, patitions and walls there is no further house.

2. The knowledge (*jñāna*) and the contemplation (*samādhi*) that have as object-field (*viṣaya*) the past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) are said to be without object-field (*aviṣaya*).[1056]

This is a direct cololary of the thesis, implicit, according to which the past and the future have no real existence.

3. The career of the Buddha is distinctly different from that of the Śrāvakas.[1057]

The Śrāvakas listen to another, receive the teachings from another, keep themselves informed while staying with another, listen to the doctrine of another; they do not meditate, reflect or think for themselves; they enter into the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*samyaktvaniyāma*). They acquire the fruits (*phala*) of Srotāpanna, Sakṛdāgāmin, Anāgāmin and Arhant. The Pratyekabuddha does not have the thirty-two marks (*lakṣaṇa*) of the Great Man; they do not listen to another, do not receive the teachings of another, are not informed by staying with another, do not listen to the doctrine of another; they meditate, think, and reflect by themselves; they receive the assurance of eventually attaining enlightenment; they attain the fruits of Srotāpanna, Anāgāmin and Arhant; they do not see and do not know all things without obstacle, they do not attain mastery or supremacy by their power;[1058]they do not attain complete perfect supreme Awakening (*anuttara samyaksaṃbodhi*); they do not completely practice either the ten powers (*bala*) of the Tathāgata or the four fearlessnesses (*abhaya*) or great compassion (*mahākaruṇā)* and they do not turn the wheel of Dharma (*dharmacakraṃ pravartayanti*). The Bodhisattva possesses the thirty-two marks; they do not listen to another, do not listen to another's doctrine; they meditate, reflect and think for themselves; they know and see all things without obstacle; they are destined to become Samyaksaṃbuddha, i.e., to attain by their own power sovereignty, mastery, to attain complete perfect supreme Awakening, to practice perfectly the ten powers of the Tathāgata, the four fearlessnesses, great compassion and to turn the wheel of the Dharma.

[1055] T.S. 1548, p. 626c. The same proof is repeated several times, with different comparisons. In the same passage, the *atman*, translated by *ngô*, is distinguished from the *pudgala*, translated by *jen*.
[1056] Ibid., p. 593c and 717ab. See Kathāvatthu, IX, thesis IX, 6 and 7, thesis 14 of the Uttarāpathakas.
[1057] Ibid., p. 585ab.
[1058] The old Japanese version, to the contrary, grants them omniscience, mastery, power and supremacy.

4. The intermediary existence (*antarābhava*) does not exist.[1059]

The *antaraparinirvāyin* is defined in this way: "…because of his previous actions, he necessarily must be reborn by receiving a divine body… in this divine body he is antaraparinirvāyin… When his life in the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*) is ended, he is reborn among the Gods of the form realm (*rūpadhātu*). In this divine life *(āyus*), in the abandonment of things, he is *paranirvāyin*."

5. The afflictionss (*kleśa*), hence the tendencies (*anuśaya*), are dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*); they do not arise with the mind (*na cittasahajāta*), they do not persist with the mind (*na cittashasthita*), they do not cease with the mind (*na cittasahaniruddha*).[1060]

6. The nature (*bhāva*) of the mind (*citta*) is pure (*prabhāsvara*). It is the adventitious impurities *(āgantukakleśa*) that defile it.[1061]<195>

7. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*śraddhā),* exertion (*vīrya*), mindfulness (*smṛti*), meditation (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*prajñā)* are not included (*aparyāpanna*) exclusively in the three realms, and consequently they are exclusively supramundane (*lokottara*) and never worldly (*laukika*).[1062]

8. Like all the members of the Path (*mārga*), right view (*samyagsṛṣṭī*) is exclusively not included (*paryāpanna*) in the three realms and consequently is exclusively supramundane (*lokottara*) and never worldly (*laukika*).[1063]

9. The form (*rūpa*) of the saint is Path (*mārga*).[1064]

The Truth of the Path (*mārgasatya*) that is material (*rūpin*) is: right speech (*samyagvāc*), right coonduct (*samyakkarmānta*), right livelihood (*samyagājīva*) and right physical exertion (*samyakkāyavyāyāma*).[1065]

10. There are nine non-conditioneds (*asaṃskṛta*): cessation through discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*), cessation without discrimination (*apratisaṃkhyānirodha*), interdependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*), the realm of infinite space *(ākāśānantyāyatana*), the realm of infinite consciousness (*vijñānānantyāyatana*), the realm of nothingness *(ākiñcanyāyatana*), the realm with neither perception nor non-perception (*naivasaṃjñānāsaṃjñayatana*).[1066]

11. The four Fruits of the religious life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*) are the same as nirvāṇa and, which comes to the same thing, the same as cessation through discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*). Consequently, they are non-conditioned only.[1067]

12. Cessation through discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*), i.e., nirvāṇa, is good (*kuśala*) and either with further learning (*śaikṣa*) or with no further learning (*aśaikṣa*).[1068]

[1059] Ibid., p. 587b.
[1060] Ibid., p. 690b.
[1061] Ibid., p. 697b.
[1062] Ibid., p. 567c.
[1063] Ibid., p. 559b.
[1064] Ibid., p. 554c and 552a.
[1065] Ibid., p. 531bc and 540ab.
[1066] Ibid., p. 526c, 529c, 535a, 538b, 663bc, 613a.
[1067] Ibid., p. 526c, 553c, 613a.
[1068] Ibid., p. 557c.

13. There is form (*rūp*a) in the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*), i.e., the discipline (*śīla*) of the body (*kāya*) and speech (*vāc*), non-information (*avijñapti*), bodily effort (*kāyavyāyāma*), physical lightness (*kāyaghutva*), all impure (*sasrava*).[1069]

14. Like all the aggregates (*skandha*), form (*rūpa*) is good (*kuśala*), bad (*akuśala*) or indeterminate (*avyākṛta*).[1070]

Good form is that which should be cultivated that is produced by a good mind (*citta*), information by way of the body (*kāyavijñapti*), information by way of speech (*vāgvijñapti*), bodily discipline (*kāyaśīla*), vocal discipline (*vākśīla*), non-information (*avijñapti*), physical effort (*kāyavyāyāma*), bodily lightness (*kāyalaghutva*), right speech (*samyagvāc*), right conduct (*samyakkarmānta*), right livelihood (*samyagājīva*), right bodily lightness (*samyakkāyalaghutva*). Bad form is that which should be abandoned that is produced by bad minds, information by way of the body, information by way of speech, bodily and voal misdeeds (*duḥśīla*), non-information, impure (*sāsrava*) phyical effort. Indeterminate form is that which is neither maturation nor a phenomenon of the law of maturation <196> (*naivavipākanavipākadharma*), the sense-spheres *(āyatana*) of the eye (*cakṣus*), ear (*śrotra*), nose (*ghrāna*), tongue (*jihva*), body (*kāya*), smells (*gandha*), tastes (*rasa*) and tangibles (*spraṣṭavya*), beautiful (*śubha*) or ugly (*aśubha*) forms (*rūpa*), etc., form produced by indeterminate minds, information by way of the body, information by way of speech.

15. In the form realm (*rūpadhātu*) there are the sense-spheres *(āyatana*) and elements (*dhātu*) of the eye (*cakṣus*), ear (*śrotra*), body *(kāya*), forms (*rūpa*), sounds (*śabda*), tangibles (*spraṣṭavya*) and the elements of the visual consciousness (*cakṣurvijñāna*), the auditory consciousness (*śrotravijñāna*) and bodily consciousness (*kāyavijñāna*), as well as the mental (*manas*) spheres and elements and mental phenomena (*dharma*) and the element of the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*).[1071]

16. In the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*), only the mental (*manas*) spheres *(āyatana*) and elements (*dhātu*) and mental phenomena, and the element of mental consciousness (*manovijṇāna*) exist.[1072]

17. The five sensory consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) are exclusively endowed with passions (*sarāga*).[1073]

18. There are only five destinies (*gati*).[1074]

19. There is pure conduct (*brahmacarya*) among the Gods (*deva*).[1075]

Only the Gods of long life (*dīrghāyus*), i.e., the Asaṃjñin are unable to practice pure conduct.

20. Form (*rūpa*) is maturation (*vipāka*).[1076]

Form that is maturation is formed from the spheres of the eye (*cakṣus*), ear (*śrotra*), nose (*ghrāna*), tongue (*jihva*), body (*kāya*), beautiful (*śubha*) or ugly (*aśubha*), etc., forms (*rūpa*) beautiful or ugly, etc., sounds

[1069] Ibid., p. 552a.
[1070] Ibid., p. 549ab,
[1071] Ibid., p. 533b and 542a.
[1072] Ibid,, p. 533b and 542a.
[1073] Ibid., p. 535c-536a.
[1074] Ibid., p. 690b.
[1075] Ibid., p. 654c.
[1076] Ibid., p.550b.

(*śabda*) beautiful or ugly, etc., perfumes (*gandha*), bodily qualities, information (*vijñapti*) by way of the body and the speech, bodily and vocal disciplines (*śīla*), non-information (*avijñapti*), bodily effort (*kāyavyāyāma*), bodily lightness (*kāyalaghutva*), right speech (*samyagvyāyāma*), right conduct (*samyakkarmānta*), right livelihood (*samayagājīva*), right physical effort, right lightness of body.

21. The faculty of life (*jīvitendriya*) is non-material (*arūpin*).[1077]

22. The disciplines (*śīla*) are neither mental nor accompanying the mind (*cittānuparivartin*).[1078]

The disciplines are exclusively material (*rūpin*).

23. Sound (*śabda*) is maturation (*vipāka*).[1079]

The sound that is maturation is the one that actions (*karman*) and defilements (*kleśa*) have produced and that are an integral part of the person *(ātmabhāva*), sounds that are beautiful or ugly, those that are produced in information by speech.

24. The six sensory spheres *(āyatana*) are maturation (*vipāka*).[1080]

The five spheres of the eye (*cakṣus*), ear (*śrotra*), nose (*ghrāna*), <197> tongue *(jihva*) and body (*kāya*) are exclusively maturation. The mental sphere is of three types.

25. Form (*rūpa*) is seeing (*paśyate)* by means of the eye *(cakṣus*).[1081]

26. One mind (*citta*) can last for a very long time.[1082]

In the diamond-like contemplation (*vajropamasamādhi*), the mind can last (*tiṣṭhati*) an immeasurable length (*apramāna*) of time (*kāla*).

27. The Arhant has abandoned all the affictions (*kleśa*).[1083]

28. The earth element (*pṛthivīdhātu*) is maturation (*vipāka*) like the other great elements (*mahābhūta*).[1084]

The great elements that are maturation are those that are produced by actions (*karman*) and defilements (*kleśa*) and that are an integral part of the person *(ātmabhāva*).

29. Form (*rūpa*) is cause (*hetu*) and caused (*sahetuka*).[1085]

The form that is cause is that which is good or bad (see thesis 14).

30. Noble *(ārya*) form (*rūpa*) is that which is derived from the great elements (*mahābhūta*).[1086]

It is, in fact, the form that is included in the Path (*mārga*) (see thesis 9).

31. The sphere of mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*) is completely knowable (*jñeya*), understandable (*prajñeya*) and perceptible to the consciousness (*vijñeya*).[1087]

[1077] Ibid., p. 561a.
[1078] Ibid., p. 575a and 574c.
[1079] Ibid., p. 531c, 540ab.
[1080] Ibid., p. 531bc, 532ab, 539a and 540b.
[1081] Ibid., p. 525c, 534b, 560a, 588b.
[1082] Ibid., p. 591b, 698a, 715ab.
[1083] Ibid., p. 586a.
[1084] Ibid., p. 573b.
[1085] Ibid., p. 548b.
[1086] Ibid., p. 545c-546a.
[1087] Ibid.,, p. 529c.

32. The Truth of cessation (*nirodhasatya*) alone is unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*), the other three Truths alone are conditioned (*saṃskṛta*). [1088]

33. There are indeterminate (*avyakṛta*) dharmas.[1089]

34. There is a non-information (*avijñapti*) that is mental action and is part of the sphere of mental phenomena (*dharmāyatana*) included in the aggregate of form (*rūpaskaandha*).[1090]

35. Noble *(ārya*) dharmas have maturation (*vipāka*).[1091]

Thus, the Truth of the Path (*mārgasatya*), the eight noble sense-faculties (*indriya*) and the seven factors of enlightenment (*bodhyaṇga*) are maturation.

36. The candidate for the Fruit of Stream-enterer possesses the faculty of faith *(ṣraddendriya*).[1092]

37. The four great elements (*mahābhūta*) are invisible (*anidarśana*).[1093]

38. All the faculties (*indriya*) are invisible (*anidarśana*).[1094]

39. There are some things (*dharma*) included (*samgṛhita*) within others.[1095]

40. There are things (*dharma*) associated with others.[1096]

41. The aggregates (*skandha*) are destroyed at death and consequently do not transmigrate.[1097] <198>

42. There are physical actions (*kāyakarman*) and vocal actions (*vākkarman*) distinct from volition, intention (*cetanā*).[1098]

43. The three roots of evil (*akuśala*) are not actions (*karman*).[1099]

44. Form (*rūpa*) has no object (*anālambana*).[1100]

45. There are eight worldly (*laukika*) dharmas: gain and loss, fame and blame, celebrity and denigration, happiness and misfortune.[1101]

46. There are six emptinesses (*śūnyatā).[1102]*

Internal emptiness (*adhyātmaśūnyatā)* concerns all internal things. External emptiness (*bahirdāśūnyatā)* concerns all external things. Internal-external emptiness (*adhyāṭmabahirdhā-śūnyatā)* concerns internal and external things. The emptiness of emptiness (*śūnyatāśūnyatā)* concerns the emptiness of the contemplation (*samādhi*) of emptiness. Great emptiness (*mahāśūnyatā)* concerns everything. The emptiness of absolute

[1088] Ibid., p. 557a.
[1089] Ibid., p. 576c *et passim*.
[1090] Ibid., p. 581a, 526c, 535a, 543ab.
[1091] Ibid., p. 555a, 562ac, 568c.
[1092] Ibid., p. 585c and 588b.
[1093] Ibid., p. 573a.
[1094] Ibid., p. 561b.
[1095] Ibid., p. 661a-671b.
[1096] Ibid., 671c-679a *et passim*.
[1097] Ibid., p. 552c.
[1098] Ibid., p. 581a.
[1099] Ibid., p. 570c.
[1100] Ibid., p.547b.
[1101] Ibid., p. 654ab.
[1102] Ibid., 633ab.

meaning (*paramārthaśūnyatā)* concerns nirvāṇa, This is the emptiness of the self *(ātman*) and of what belongs to the self *(ātmaka*). This emptiness is permanent (*nitya*), unchangeable (*aviparinā̃ma*).

47. The craving for non-existence (*vibhavatṛṣṇā)* is abandoned only by cultivation (*bhāvanā)* for it is not abandoned by seeing (*darśana*). [1103]

48. Examination (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) are associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).[1104]

49. Volition (*cetanā)* is not merely cause of maturation (*vipākahetu*) and feeling (*vedanā)* is not merely fruit of maturation (*vipakaphala*).[1105]

All the aggregates (*skandha*) are both cause and fruit of maturation.

50.Volition (*cetanā)* is not mind (*citta*) but mental event (*caitta*).[1106]

51. Mind (*citta*) and mental events (*caitta*) are provided with object (*sālambana*).[1107]

52. Consciousness (*vijñana*), i.e., the mind (*citta*), cannot be said (*na vaktavya*) either to be associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*) or dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[1108]

53. Physical action (*kāyakarman*) is invisible (*anidarśana*).[1109]

54. There are mental (*caitta*) dharmas.[1110]

55. Old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*) are neither maturation (*vipāka*) nor things of the law of maturation (*vipākadharma*).[1111]

56. The divine eye (*divyacakṣus*) is clearly distinct from the fleshly eye (*maṃsacakṣus*).[1112]

The fleshly eye is distinct from the divine eye in that it is fomed of substance derived from the four great elements (*mahābhuta*).

57. There is an Arhant with "the same head" (*samaśīrsin*).

This is the one who abandons the defilements *(āsrava*) and his life *(āyus*) at the same time. <199>

58. There are Paths (*mārga*) with one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten or eleven members (*aṇga*).[1113]

The Path with one member consists of the single foundation of mindfulness of body (*kāyasmṛtyupasthāna*) thanks to which the four fruits of the religious life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*) can be attained. The Path with two members consists of meditation (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*prajñā).* The Path with three members consists of three contemplations of the first two meditations (*savitarkavicāra, avitarkavicāramātra, avitarkāvicāra*) or of the three supramundane (*lokottara*) contemplations (*śūnyatā, animitta, apranīdhāna*). The Path with four members consists of the four *smṛtyupasthāna*, the four *samyakpradhāna*, the four *ṛddhipāda*, etc. The Path

[1103] Ibid., p. 585c.
[1104] Ibid., p. 545b and 547b.
[1105] Ibid., p. 548b and 550b.
[1106] Ibid., p. 547b.
[1107] Ibid., p. 547bc.
[1108] Ibid., p. 547b.
[1109] Ibid., p. 545c and 547c.
[1110] Ibid., p. 576a *et passim*.
[1111] Ibid., p. 545b and 550c.
[1112] Ibid., p. 593a.
[1113] Ibid., p. 625a.

with five members consists of the five *indriya*, the five *bala*, etc. The Path with six members consists of the six *smṛti,* the six *vidyāṇga*, etc. The others are analogous.

59. The Path (*mārga*) is either mental (*caitta*) or non-mental.[1114]

The mental path consists of right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*), right intention (*samyaksaṃkalpa*), right mental effort (*samyagmanovyāyāma*), right mindfulness (*samyaksmṛti*) and right contemplation (*samyaksamādhi*).

60. The Path (*mārga*) must be cultivated (*bhāvayitavya*).[1115]

61. Conditioned dharmas (*samskṛta*) have as characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) production (*utpāda*), duration (*sthiti*) and cessation (*nirodha*).[1116]

62. Unconditioned dharmas (*asaṃskṛta*) have no causes (*hetu*).[1117]

63. The aggregate of the formations (*saṃskāraskandha*) is either associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*) or dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*).[1118]

64. Life (*jīvita*) is neither a consequnce of the mind (*cittānuparivartin*) nor a co-existent of the mind (*cittasahabhū*).[1119]

65. The five sense consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) are exclusively indeterminate (*avyākṛta*).[1120]

66. There are actions (*karman*) without maturation (*avipāka*).[1121]

67. There are meditations (*dhyāna*) not included (*aparyāpanna*) in the three realms, therefore supramundane (*lokottara*).[1122]

68. Examination (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) are either pure (*anāsrava*) or impure (*sāsrava*).[1123]

69. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*śraddhā),* etc., are exclusively pure (*anāsrava*) and good (*kuśala*). [1124]

70. There is examination (*vitarka*) and reflection (*vicāra*) only in the first meditation (*dhyāna*).[1125]

71. There is no from (*rūpa*) in the mind (*citta*).[1126]

72. The trainings (*śīla*), belonging exclusively to the desire realm (*kāmadhātu*), are never supramundane (l*okottara*) and the Saint <200> cannot possess two trainings, one worldly (*laukika*), the other supraworldly.[1127]

73. Discipline (*saṃvara*) is action (*karman*).[1128]

[1114] Ibid., p. 555c, 556a.
[1115] Ibid., p. 557b.
[1116] Ibid., p. 633b.
[1117] Ibid., p. 529c and 538a.
[1118] Ibid., p. 547b.
[1119] Ibid., p. 563bc.
[1120] Ibid., p. 539a.
[1121] Ibid., p. 580b.
[1122] Ibid., p. 718a and 552b.
[1123] Ibid., p. 546ab and 552b.
[1124] Ibid., p. 661b-624c.
[1125] Ibid., p.621b-624c.
[1126] Ibid., p. 545c.
[1127] Ibid., p. 575a.
[1128] Ibid., p. 581ab, 529a, 537c.

74. Old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*) are never supramundane (*lokottara*) but are exclusively mundane (*laukika*).[1129]

75. Since the five sense consciousnesses (*vijñāna*) belong neither to those with training (*śaikṣa*) nor to those of no-more training *(aśaikṣa*), the Path is not cultivated while being endowed with the five sense consciousnesses (*pañcavijñānasamāṇgin*).[1130]

76. There is knowledge (*jñāna*) of the past (*atīta*), the future (*anāgata*) and the present (*pratyutpanna*).[1131]

77. All the meditations (*dhyāna*) have members (*aṇga*).[1132]

78. The candidate for the fruit of Srotāpanna has not yet abandoned the manifestly active afflictions (*paryavasthāna*) of conceptual theories (*dṛṣṭi*) and doubt (*vicikitsā*).[1133]

79. One does not become completely extinguished (*parinirvāyin*) as soon as one is reborn (*upapadyate*).[1134]

The *upapadyaparinirvāyin* is defined in this way: "… due to his previous actions, he necessarily receives a divine body… in this divine body he is *upapadyaparnirvāyin*… as soon as his life in *kāmadhātu* is over, he is reborn above among the Gods of *rupadhātu*; in this divine life *(āyus*) he experiences happiness (*sukha*) and much detachment (*virāga*); he is *upapadyaparinirvāyin*." <201>

[1129] Ibid., p. 552b and 550b.
[1130] Ibid., p. 539b.
[1131] Ibid., p. 594c.
[1132] Ibid., p. 621b-624c.
[1133] Ibid., p. 585c.
[1134] Ibid., p. 586bc.

CHAPTER XXVII

The Kāśyapīyas or Suvarṣakas

All the sources agree in making the Kāśyapīyas arise from the Sthaviras, some time after the schism of the Sarvāstivādins. The sources of the north-west place their appearance at the end of the 3rd century E.N.

Vasumitra identifies the Kāśyapīyas with the Suvarṣakas. Paramārtha says that the latter took their name from their teacher Suvarṣa ['good year' or 'good rains retreat'], who made a "collection of the Buddha's words in two parts in which, successively and in parallel, he refuted the heretics in one part, and in the other, he counteracted the passions of all beings."[1135]

K'ouei-ki explains that the two names of the sect are derived from two proper names, one, Suvarṣa, a Brahmin, the other, Kāśyapa, a sage *(ṛṣi*), and then he gives several legendary explanations of these two names.[1136]

Bhavya (1st list) and Tāranātha[1137]also explain the name Kāśyapīya as coming from the name of the teacher of their sect, Kāśyapa.

Inscriptions note the presence of the Kāśyapīyas towards the middle of the 3rd century of our era at Takṣaśilā,[1138] at Bedadi 200 km. north-east of this city,[1139]and towards the middle of the 5th century, at Pālāṭu Ḍherī, near Peshawar.[1140] But in the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang and then I-tsing found their descendants, degenerate and having gone over to the Mahāyāna, only in Uḍḍiyāṇa[1141] and, outside India, in Kharachar and Khotan.[1142] They did not seem to have lived outside of the extreme north-west of India.

According to some works, the Kāśyapīyas wore robes of the color of *Magnolia obovata*, i.e., dark red, and were distinguished by the courage and care with which they protected and saved beings.[1143]

Of their literature, we know only a short treatise on discipline (T.S. 1460). According to some indications, they seem to have had a special *Vinayapiṭaka*.[1144] Since Vasumitra and the Sammatīyas cited by Bhavya attest that their doctrine was very close to that of the Dharmaguptaka, we may assume that they had a

[1135] Demiéville: *Origines des sectes bouddhiques*, p. 62 and 23.
[1136] K'ouei-ki, II, p. 9a.
[1137] Schiefner: Tāranātha, p. 273.
[1138] Sten Konow: C.I.I., vol. II part 1, *Kharosṭhī inscrptions*, p. 88.
[1139] Ibid., p. 89.
[1140] Ibid., p. 120-122.
[1141] Watters: *Yuan-chwang's travels*, I, p. 226.
[1142] Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. xxiv and 20. Tāranātha (Schiefner, p. 175) confirms that the Kāśyapīyas had disappeared by the 7th century.
[1143] T.S. 1465, p. 900c; T.S. 1470, p. 926a.
[1144] Watters, *op. cit*., I, p. 226; Lin Li-Kouang: *Introduction*, p. 189-192.

Canon very close to that of the latter. In particular, the *Vinayamātṛkā*,[1145] which is attributed to the Haimavatas because it often speaks about the Himālaya and the authors of which had a Canon very close to <202> that of the Dharmaguptakas, is perhaps a work of the Kāśyapīyas. Their *Sūtrapiṭaka* must have been quite similar to if not identical with that of the Dharmaguptakas. As for the *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, it is possible that the Kāśyapīyas borrowed that of the Dharmaguptakas, i.e., probably the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra*, the few theses on which the two sects disagreed probably being consigned to post-canonical works as was often the case.

Here are their special theses:

1. Past (*atīta*) action the fruit (*phala*) of which has not yet ripened (*avipāka*) exists. The rest of the past does not exist.[1146]

This is their fundamental thesis, the one that undoubtedly obliged them to form an autonomous sect. It represents a compromise between the Sarvāstivādin opinions and those of the Mahīśāsakas and oher Vibhajyavādins.

It is the same, they say, with plants: as long as the shoot has not yet arisen, the seed exists. But as soon as the shoot appears, the seed does not exist.

2. That which is abandoned (*prahāna*) is completely known (*parijñā).* That which has not been abandoned is not completely known.[1147]

The three Tibetan translations of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva, as well as the Chinese translation of the Ts'in by Vasumitra are in greement in establishing the text in this way. The Chinese versions of Vasumitra by Paramārtha and by Hiuan-tsang have a very different text, probably erroneous: "If a thing (*dharma*) has already been abandoned (*prahīṇa*) and already completely known (*parijñā),* it no longer exists. That which has not yet been abandoned and not yet completely known exists." This last proposition seems then to be a corollary to the first Kāśyapīya thesis and may be interpreted thus: the afflictions (*kleśa*) and the impurities *(āsrava*) exist only while one is not freed of them and then they can produce harmful fruits.

As for the thesis given by the other translators, which is certainly more correct, it means that the abandonments (*prahāṇa*) are identical to the complete knowledges (*parijñā),* i.e., that only the complete knowledges consisting of abandonment (*prahāṇaparijñā)* exist and the complete knowledges consisting of knowledge (*jñānaparijñā*) do not exist, as the Sarvāsitvādins claim to the contrary.[1148] Therefore it follows that for the Kāśyapīyas the fact of knowing a defilement or a passion completely is a necessary and sufficient cause to be delivered from it.

[1145] T.S. 1463. Cf. above, chap. XIV.

[1146] Vasumitra, thesis 2; Bhavya, thesis 1. *Kathāvatthu*, I, 8; *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, T.S. 1646, p. 258c; Vibhāṣā, T.S. 1545, p. 96b, 263c, 741b; T.S. 1546, p. 204c. Cf. L.V.P: *Kośa*, V, p. 52 (attributed by Vasubandhu to the Vibhajyavādins); Vinītadeva, theses 2 and 3 of the Vibhajyavādins.

[1147] Vasumitra, thesis 1; Bhavya, thesis 2; Vinītadeva, thesis 1 of the Kāśyapīyas (according to thesis 8 of the Mūlasarvāstivādins).

[1148] See L.V.P.: *Kośa*, V, p. 110-118.

3. All that is conditioned (*saṃskṛta*) has the past (*atīta*) as cause (*hetu*). Nothing conditioned has the future (*anāgata*) as cause.[1149]

This rejection of any finalism is evidently aimed at the Sautrāntikas and Sarvāstivādins according to whom future things can be causes of retribution (*vipākahetu*), homogeneous causes (*sabhāgahetu*) and enabling causes (*karaṇahetu*).[1150] According to K'ouei-ki who comments on this opinion, the Kāśyapīyas denied <203> even that the present (*pratyutpanna*) could be enabling cause in relation to the future, as the Sarvāstivādins would have it.[1151]

4. The dharmas of those in training (*śaikṣa*) are fruits of retribution (*vipākahetu*).[1152]

This proposition is aimed at thesis in which, according to some schools, *śaikṣa* dharmas do not bear fruits, which could seem to be so, i.e., *aśaikṣa dharmas* being caused by previous practices.[1153]

5. All conditioned dharmas are destroyed instantaneously (*kṣaṇikniruddha*).[1154]

Vasumitra and Bhavya attest that their other theses were mainly similarly to those of the Dharmaguptakas. <204>

[1149] Vaumitra, thesis 3; Vinītadeva, theses 2 of the Kāśyapīyas.
[1150] Ibid., II, p. 247.
[1151] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 45ab.
[1152] Vasumitra, thesis 5; Vinītadeva, thesis 3 of the Kaśyapīyas.
[1153] K'ouei-ki, III, p. 45b-46a.
[1154] Vasumitra, thesis 4.

CHAPTER XXVIII

The Tāmraśātīyas

They are known only by the generally late sources, i.e., the Sammatīyas and the Mahāsāṇghikas cited by Bhavya, then Vinītadeva and the *Bhikṣuvarṣāgrapṛcchāsūtra*.

The two first sources, which are the oldest, place the Tāmraśātīyas beside the Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas and Kāśyapīyas in the group or subgroup of the Vibhajyavādins, and distinguish them clearly from the Sautrāntikas or Saṃkrāntivādins who are, on the contrary, closely related to the Sarvāstivādins. Vinītadeva places them in the Sarvāstivādin group along with the Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, etc., specifying that the Tāmraśātīyas are identical to the Saṃkrāntivādins. Finally, the last source places them, certainly in error, among the Sammatīyas.

Tāranātha notes that the Tāmraśātīyas were identical to the Saṃkrāntivādins, Uttarīyas, Sautrāntikas and Dārṣṭāntkas who formed but one and the same school. He adds that they still existed at the time of the Pāla kings (10th century).[1155]

Bhavya alone has transmitted one of their theses to us: "The individual (*pudgala*) does not exist." This is not in the least original in Buddhism and tells us nothing about this school.

Although Tāranātha claims that the sect took its name from that of its teacher and founder, the etymology shows rather that it owed it to the copper (*tāmra*) color of their robes (*śātī*). But this last piece of information is quite useless to us. <205>

Chapter XXVIII
[1155] Schiefner: *Tāranātha*, p. 273 and 274.

CHAPTER XXIX

The Theravādins of the Mahāvihāra

This sect is by far the best known for the main reason that they still flourish today in Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Cambodia and Laos, and that it has thus been able to preserve a very rich literature, the main works of which are well known in the West. By particularly good luck, among these are included chronicles that tell the history of the sect in Ceylon since the reign of Aśoka. Although all the information in these chronicles should not be accepted blindly, we are able, with the help of healthy criticism, to retrace with some certainty the grand features of this history not too cluttered up with legends as is unfortunately too often the case in India.

Despite all the information that we have, the origin of this school, remains somewhat obscure. In fact, the Pāli word 'Theravādin' corresponds to the Sanskrit 'Sthaviravādin', and the first European scholars who studied it identified the Theravādins with the Sthaviras, i.e., with the most orthodox sect, the one that remained strictly faithful, it is said, to the teaching of the Buddha. It must be confessed that the archaic nature of certain parts of the doctrine and the Theravādin customs seems to confirm this identification. The problem is not so simple in reality, for the canonical works of the sect superabundantly prove to us that it had taken part in a great number of controversies unknown to early Buddhism and that it had thereby clearly been distinguished from the latter. If the Theravādins are not the early Sthaviras, then who are they? This is an embarrassing question at first sight. Actually, none of the lists of the sects prior to the end of the 7th century of our era, including the lists drawn up by the Theravādins themselves, mention the latter among the twenty-some sects of the Hinayāna. Only at the end of the 7th century do they appear in the lists of four groups, forming a distinct group alongside of the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Sarvāstivādins and the Sammatīyas, a group recognizable to the three schools that compose it which are those of the Ceylonese Theravādins, viz., the Mahāvihāravāsins, the Abhayagirivāsins and the Jetavanīyas. However, this does not resolve the question, for none of these schools is cited in any of the earlier lists. If we did not have the Ceylonese chronicles and their lists of sects, we would be quite tempted to consider this group of three schools as a late group that appeared in the course of the 7th century of our era or hardly any earlier. But we know from the chronicles and other evidence that such is not the case. Therefore we must identify the Theravādins with another sect the name of which appears in our lists.

The examination of theses particular to the Theravādins, such as we know from the *Kathāvatthu*, allows the question thus asked to be resolved. The Theravādins reject the theses characteristic of the Mahāsāṇghikas, the <206> Vātsīputrīyas, the Sarvāstivādins and the Kāśyapīyas. Therefore they are part of the group of sects coming from the trunk of the Sthaviras which belong neither to the subgroup of the Vātsīputrīyas nor that of the Sarvāstivādins. Their strong opposition to the latter is clearly affirmed by the fact that they reject the compromise thesis of the Kāśyapīyas. Thus they are related to the Mahīśāsakas and the

Dharmaguptakas. Even a superficial examination of the doctrines shows that they should not be identified with either of the two, certain theses of whom they reject, but rather that they are related to the former.

This fact is confirmed by the examination of some philological information. Przyluski and Hofinger, in their studies on the first two councils, have shown how many of the accounts of these in the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Theravādins and in those of the Mahīśāsakas are similar.[1156] Minayeff and La Vallée Poussin cite a Ceylonese tradition according to which the Theravādin Canon was borrowed from the Mahīśāsakas.[1157] Although this information is obviously wrong, nonetheless it is significant. Finally, the list of sects furnished by the Ceylonese tradition differs from all the other lists in that it presents the Mahīśāsakas as one of the two mother sects along with the Vātsīputrīyas, coming from the trunk of the Sthaviras. Actually, it makes the Sabbatthivādins, the Dhammaguttikas, the Kassapikas, the Saṇkantikas and the Suttavādas come from the Mahīṣāsakas. This anomaly has its exact counterpart in the one which closes the list of the Sarvāstivādins of the north-west, which makes all the Sthavira sects with the exception of only the Haimavatas come from the Sarvāstivādins. Finally, we should not forget that it was in Ceylon that Fa-hien found the Mahīśāsaka *Vinayapiṭaka* in 412 of our era.[1158] All of this proves that the Ceylonese tradition had undergone strong influences of the Mahīśāsakas and that the latter resided in Ceylon and southern India. Nevertheless, and we repeat, the Theravādins are not Mahīśāsakas.

In the story of the council of Pāṭaliputra according to the Ceylonese tradition, orthodoxy is represented by the Vibhajyavādins. But the traditions of the Sammatīyas and the Mahāsāṇghikas group the Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas and Tāmraśātīyas, i.e., the non-Vātsīputrīya Sthaviras who rejected the fundamental thesis of the Sarvāstivādins, precisely under the name of Vibhajyavādin. The *Vibhāṣā,* the major work of the Sarvāstivādins, severely criticizes the Vibhajyavādins, attributing to them forty very eclectic theses. From all of this, we can conclude that the Theravādins are Vibhajyavādins in the sense intended by the traditions of the Sammatīyas and the Mahāsāṇghikas and undoubtedly also the Sarvāstivādins, i.e., the non-Vātsīputrīya Sthaviras opposed to the Sarvāstivādins. La Vallée Poussin has, besides, recognized in the Maudgalyāyana whom the Sarvāstivādin *Vijñānakāya* denounces as the major opponent of the Sarvāstivāda, the Tissa Moggaliputta who, according to the Ceylonese chroinicles, presided over the council of Pāṭalipurra and defined the orthodoxy as Vibhajjavādin.[1159] The Theravādins thus consist of a sect of this subgroup of the Vibhajyavādins. They obviously represent the archaistic tendency of this subgroup beside the Mahīśāsakas, Dharmaguptakas and Kāśyapīyas whose doctrines evolved over a longer time. Without doubt, their insularity was a factor in the slowness of their doctrinal evolution. It is possible that in the early times they were considered and perhaps considered themselves <207> to be a school of the Mahīśāsakas. Be that as it may, in the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang and I-tsing distinguished them clearly from the latter whom they rightly or wrongly classed among the group of the Sarvāstivādins.

[1156] Przyluski: *Concile de Rājagṛha*, p. 307 to 332; Hofinger: *Concile de Vaiśali*, p. 161 to 168.
[1157] Legge: *Record of buddhist kingdoms*, p. 111.
[1158] L.V.P.: *L'Inde au temps des Maurya*, p. 133 to 139.
[1159] L.V.P.: *L'Inde au temps des Maurya*, p. 133 to 139.

According to the Ceylonese tradition, Buddhism was introduced into Ceylon by Mahinda and Saṇghamitrā, son and daughter of Aśoka, in the first year of the reign of Devanāmpiya Tissa, 6th king of Ceylon. This pious king immediately built the great monastery, Mahāvihāra, in his capital, Anurādhapura, in order to shelter the piece of the sacred Bodhi tree which the two missionaries had brought. The founding of the Mahāvihāra, which would remain the great center of the Theravādins, occurred about 240 years before our era. As we have just seen, the monks who settled in the Mahāvihāra were Vibhajyavādins related to the Mahīsāsakas.

For the greater part of the 2nd century before our era, Ceylon was dominated by the conquering Tamils who were non-Buddhist but who did not persecute the monks. Be that as it may, the Chronicles describe this period as particularly disturbed, for the Ceylonese resisted the invaders fiercely. These wars certainly had the main effect of isolating Ceylon from continental India and reducing considerably the relationship between the Ceylonese Vibhajyavādins and other Buddhists. Thus when the authochthonous king Duṭṭhagāmani, about 109 years before our era, rid the island of the invader Tamils, the Theravādins, through the force of circumstances, constituted a distinct sect.

Duṭṭhagāmani re-establishd the pious and sumptuous traditions of Devanāmpiya Tissa. Like him, he built many religious monuments, monasteris, reliquaries, etc. During the founding of the Thūpārāma, Ceylon was visited, it seems, by delegations of monks coming from all of India, not just from Bodhagayā, Rājagaha, Vesalī, Varanāsī, Kosambī, Pāṭaliputta, the holy cities of the middle Ganges basin, but also from Kasmīra, from the land of the Palavas (i.e., undoubtedly eastern Iran), from Alassanda (the Alexandria of the Caucasus, in Kapiśa), from Ujjenī, from the Vindhya mountains.[1160] Although this information is certainly legendary, as is shown by the number of monks making up each delegation, altogether about a million and a half men, it is probably at least that the power of Duṭṭagāmani favored the frequency of relations between the Buddhism of Ceylon and that of India.

The reign of Vaṭṭagāmani, at the end of the 1st century before our era, was marked by two important events. First, this king founded a new monastery, Abhayagirivihāra, which almost immediately became a home for heresy and remained that for over a thousand years. The discord led the king to bring together a local council in the course of which the *Tipiṭaka* and the Commentaries or *Aṭṭhakathā,* until then preserved orally, were written down.[1161]

In the 3rd century of our era, an inscription at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa in the land of Andhra, mentions a donation to the community of Taṃbapaṃna, i.e., of Ceylon, "who has converted the Kaśmiras, the Gandhāras, the Chīnas [Chinese], the Chilātas [Kirātas, a savage mountain people], the Tosalīs [Orissa], the Avaraṃtas [Aparānta, Bombay area], the Vaṇgas [Bengal], the Vanavāsis, the Yavanas [Greco-Bactrian kingdoms]…" It is evident that these claims are greatly exaggerated, but we can see in them the traces of missions sent

[1160] *Mahāvaṃsa*, p. 193-194.
[1161] Ibid., p. 235-237.

forth before the end of the 3rd century of our <208> era, and perhaps even before its beginning, by the community of Ceylon into these various regions. It is evident that the zeal used by these missionaries, if however they existed, was poorly rewarded in most of these lands.

In the middle of the 4th century, in the reign of Mahāsena, the Mahāvihāravāsin sect was persecuted cruelly. A Chola monk, Saṃghamitta, very devoted to the Abhayagirivāsins, obtained permission from the king to chase out the monks from the Mahāvihāra and to destroy their monastery. But the supporters of the latter, under threat of revolt, succeeded in persuading the king to get rid of the heretic and to rebuild the Mahāvihāra. The Jetavanavihāra, which soon became the general base for a new schismatic school, was founded in this same reign.[1162]

The 5th century is the period of the great Theravādin commentators of the Mahāvihāra, viz. Buddhadatta, Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla. Buddhadatta was born and lived at Uragapura (present-day Urayur) on the banks of the Kaverī in Chola country. Buddhaghosa was a Brahmin born near Bodh-Gayā who converted to Buddhism. Tradition has it that he stayed in Ceylon, but Finot contests this fact.[1163] His mission in Burma is purely a legend. In any case, his vast work attests to the breadth of his learning and makes him the great thinker and writer of the Theravādins. His *Visudhhimagga* is rightly renowned. Dhammapāla was a Tamil who lived in the region of Kāñcī. It is remarkable that none of these great commentators was a native of Ceylon. This proves that the brilliance and influence of the Ceylonese community was powerful in southern India and even as far as Magadha. The main task of Buddhaghosa and his two illustrious contemporaries consisted of putting the contents of the old Ceylonese conmmentaries into works written in Pāli.

In the last years of the 5th century, king Dhātusena called together a council in the course of which the *Tipiṭaka* was revised.[1164] It is possible that during this council, the Canon was modified to a certain degree in order to be more in conformity with the doctrine of the Mahāvihāravasins.

In the first half of the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang notes the presence of the Sthaviras, i.e., the Theravādins, not only in Ceylon, of whom he speaks only by hearsay, but also in the Dravidian contry around Kāñcīpura, where there were more than 10,000 monks living in more than 100 monasteries, and in Samataṭa in the Ganges delta, where more than 2000 monks were living in more than 30 monasteries. Since this region is close to the port of Tāmralipti, the great landing-stage of India and the port at which the large number of Ceylonese landed who were going on pilgrimage to Magadha, the presence of an important Sthavira center at this place is easily explained.

Hiuan-tsang met some Mahāyāna-Sthaviras, i.e., probably non-Mahāvihāravāsin Theravādins and most likely Abhayagirivāsins, at Bodh-Gayā, the birthplace of Buddhaghosa, at Kaliṇga, at Bhārukaccha and especially at Surāṣtra, where they were almost 3000. But Hiuan-tsang's information varies in his works, and the monks of Kaliṇga (500 in all) and those of Surāṣtra are also given as Sthaviras understood as non-

[1162] *Mahāvaṃsa*, p. 265-270.
[1163] Finot: BEFEO, 1925, p. 487.
[1164] Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism*, vol. III, p. 32.

Mahāyānists. What should be remembered especially in this information is the distribution of the Theravādins, to which school they belonged, at the beginning of the 7th century: first, Ceylon, the great religious center, and the neighboring Dravidian land; then the regions neighboring the two great continental ports where the <209> Ceylonese monks going on pilgrimage to Magadha, Tāmralipti in the east and Bhārukaccha in the west, disembarked.

Fifty years later, I-tsing gives a rather similar distribution of the Theravādin realm. All belong, he says, to the sect of the Theravādins in Ceylon and almost all in southern India. Some disciples are found at Lāṭa and at Sindhu in the west. They lived side-by-side with the other sects in the east of India and at Magadha. Finally, they had been introduced but recently into the Sonde Isalands where they were a minority. But they were not found in the north of India or in Indochina or in China.

About 1160, the great Ceylonese king, Parakkama-Bahu the 1st, called together a council at Anurādhapura, presided over by Kassapa, and obliged the two dissident schools to unite in the bosom of the Mahāvihāra which remained unified thenceforth.[1165]

Then came a long period of decadence accentuated by the arrival of the Portugese whose religious fanaticism persecuted Buddhism. At the end of the 17th century, king Vimala Dharma II was compelled to have monks brought from Arakan in Burma to reconstitute the Ceylonese community. Half a century later, in 1752 and 1766, king Kittisiri Rājasiha renewed this attempt and asked king Ayuthia of Siam to send hom some monks. But the community thus re-established maintained an aristocratic recruitment. In 1802, some Burmese monks founded in Ceylon the school called Amarapura, the recruitment of which is more working-class.[1166] A more recent sect, the Ramanyas, coming from the area between Siam and Arakan, insists on the vow of poverty.[1167]

Although according to the Ceylonese traditions, Burma had been converted since before our era, there is not trace left of this fact. Up to the 11th century, the only traces found attest to the presence in Burma of a Mahāyānist and even tantric Buddhism. According to the Burmese Chronicles, it was king Anavrata who, in the 11th century, with sword in hand, brought about the conversion of Upper Burma to the Ceylonese Theravādin sect. From then on, the religious relations between Burma and Ceylon became frequent and for two centuries Pagan remained a great center of Pāli Buddhist culture.[1168] Lower Burma was converted to the Theravāda in the middle of the 13th century and also became, in the 15th century, an especially brilliant center. But the reactions of the natives against the predominance of the Ceylonese led to the founding at the end of the 12th century of the Chapaṭa school which soon divided into three branches. In the middle of the 12th century, three new schools, the two of Martaban and that of Cambodia appeared. Their rivalry was such that the king of Pégou, Dhammaceti, at the end of the 15th century, compelled them to become united

[1165] Ibid., vol. III, p. 33-34; Kern: *Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*, vol. II, p. 421-422.
[1166] Eliot: Op. cit., vol. III, p. 36.
[1167] Ibid., p. 38.
[1168] Ibid., p. 55-57.

into one, conforming to the prescriptions of the Mahāvihāra of Ceylon.[1169] In the middle of the 18th century, king Alompra encouraged Buddhism which shone brilliantly in Burma. But throughout the 18th century, the community was divided on the manner of wearing the robes between the rival factions of the Ekaṃsikas and the Parūpanas.[1170] From 1868 to 1871, the pious king Mindion-min gathered together a council which revised the *Tipiṭaka*. His fame was so great that his chaplain was chosen to arbitrate by the Ceylonese monks during a local debate.[1171] There are <210> two schools in Burma, the Mahāgandis and the Sūlagandhis, the latter being the more austere.[1172]

The date of the introduction into Siam of Theravāda Buddhism is poorly known. It has been placed around the 13th century, having come from Burma. Be that as it may, an inscription from 1361 tells us that king Sūravaṃsa Rāma sent to search for a monk from Ceylon versed in the *Tipiṭaka*, who was received with great honors.[1173] But Siamese Buddhism kept Mahāyānist traces for a long time. In 1782, king Chao Phaya Cakkri mounted the throne and convened a council whose task was to revise the *Tipiṭaka*.[1174] Kings Mongkut (1852-1868) and Chulalongkorn (1868-1911) supported Buddhsim strongly, forcing it to adopt a more strict moral code and publishing an edition of the Canon.[1175] King Mongut crated the Dhammayut school, more austere that the former school, which still exists today.

Cambodia, like Burma, was long a Mahāyāna domain. In the 13th century it was gradually converted to the Hīnayāna of the Theravādins.[1176] The only feature marking the history of the Theravādins of Cambodia is the introduction of the Siamese Dhammayut sect at the end of the 19th century.[1177]

The customs of the Theravādins vary according to the country and the school.[1178] The one common and truly characteristic trait seems to be the yellow-orange color of the monatic robes. Their sacred language is Pāli.

It may be interesting here to cite the Chinese and Tibetan information concerning the Theravādins of the 7th century.

According to I-tsing, the Theravādins wore the lower monastic robe in the manner of Indian women, bringing the right edge over the left side and letting the sides float freely.[1179]

According to some late Tibetan sources, they had as patron-saint the *vaiśya* Kātyāyana. Their habit consisted of twenty-one to twenty-five strips of cloth. Their emblem was the wheel (*cakra*) or the areca

[1169] Ibid., p. 59.
[1170] Ibid., p. 62-64.
[1171] Ibid., p. 65.
[1172] Ibid., p. 73.
[1173] Ibid., p. 83-84.
[1174] Ibid., p. 86.
[1175] Ibid., p. 87-88.
[1176] Ibid., p. 112, 124-126.
[1177] Ibid., p. 131.
[1178] Ibid., p. 36 to 132, very detailed.
[1179] Takausu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, p. 66-67.

palm flower. Their names ended in *–deva*, *-ākara*, *-varman*, *-sena*, *-jīva* or *–bala*. They spoke a vernacular dialect, lower (*paiśācī*) or intermediate.[1180]

The Theravādin literature, which has been preserved for us since the sect still exists, is both too vast and too well-known for us to describe it here in detail.

Here is the composition of the Theravādin *Tipiṭaka*:

I. *Vinayapiṭaka*:
- 1) *Suttavibhaṇga*
- 2) *Khandaka*: a) Mahāvagga
  - b) Cullavagga
- 3) *Parivāra*
- 4) *Pātimokkha*

II. *Suttapiṭaka*
- 1) *Digha-Nikāya*
- 2) *Majjhima-Nikāya*
- 3) *Saṃyutta-Nikāya*
- 4) *Aṇguttara-Nikāya* <211>
- 5) *Khuddhaka-Nikāya*
  - a) Khuddhakapātha
  - b) Dhammapada
  - c) Udāna
  - d) Itivuttika
  - e) Suttanipāta
  - f) Vimānavatthu
  - g) Peṭavatthu
  - h) Theragāthā
  - i) Therīgāthā
  - j) Jātaka
  - k) Mahāṇiddesa
  - l) Cullaniddesa
  - m) Paṭisaṃbhidāmagga
  - n) Buddhavaṃsa
  - o) Cariyāpiṭaka
  - p) Apadāna

III. *Abhidhammapiṭaka*
- 1) *Dhammasaṇgaṇi*
- 2) *Vibhaṇga*
- 3) *Kathāvatthu*
- 4) *Puggalapaññatti*
- 5) *Dhātukathā*

[1180] Lin Li-Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, p. 176-181 and 208-216.

6) *Yamaka*

7) *Paṭṭhāna*

The non-canonical literature opens up with works earlier than the 5th century of our era which are known to the great commentators. These are the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the *Peṭakopadesa*, treatises of textual and exegetical methodology, the first commentaries written in Pāli or in Ceylonese and, for the most part, lost today. A separate place should be given to the Pāli version of the Milindapañha, a famous work which is still presenting problems.

The 5th century was the period of the great commentators, Buddhadatta, Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla, whose fundamental work consisted of writing the Pāli commentaries on the entire Canon, using mainly the old Ceylonese commentaries. Buddhadatta condensed his work into four manuals: the *Abhidhammāvatāra* and the *Rūpārūpavibhāga* which deal with the *Abhidhamma*, and the *Vinayavinicchaya* and the *Uttaravinicchaya* which comment on the *Vinayapiṭaka*. The work of Buddhaghosa consists first of the *Visuddhimagga*, a general commentary on the Canon or rather the doctrine included in the Canon, that which gives it the aspect of a post-canoncial work of Abhidhamma, and then numerous commentaries each bearing on some part of the *Tipiṭaka*. On this point Dhammapāla completes the work of Buddhaghosa.

The Ceylonese Chronicles, *Dīpavaṃsa, Mahāvaṃsa, Cūlavaṃsa, Dāṭhāvaṃsa*, etc., are essentially religious books retracing the history of the Ceylonese community or the great religious events of Ceylon.

Later there was quite a flourishing of Abhidhamma manuals, the best known of which is the *Abhidhammatthasaṇgaha* of Anuruddha.

Finally, we may note a number of religious poems: the *Anāgatavaṃsa*, the *Jinacarita*, the *Telakaṭāhagāthā,* etc. <212>

Here are the theses of the Theravādins of the Mahāvihāra:

1. The person (*puggala*) is not experienced (*upalabhati*) as an obvious reality (*sacchikaṭṭhaparamatthena*).[1181]

Here are some of the numerous arguments used to prove this thesis. It is impossible to define clearly the relations that exist between the person and the aggregates, elements, spheres and faculties into which Buddhism resolves the individual: Are they the same or are they different? Do they reside in it or does it contain them? There are many untenable solutions. It is also impossible to classify this entity ‘the person’ in the various pairs of contradictory categories: Is it conditioned (*sappaccaya*) or unconditioned (*appaccaya*)? Is it composite (*saṇkhata*) or non-composite (*asaṇkhata*)? Eternal (*sassata*) or transitory (*asassata*)? If the person transmigrates from one existence to the next, is it the same that lives here and there, or is it another? If it is the same, then a man is the same as a god or an animal according to where he will be reborn in one or the other of these forms. If it is not the same, why do you say that it transmigrates?

[1181] *Kathāvatthu*, I, 1.

2. The Arahant does not regress (*parihāyati*) from the state of Arahant-hood (*arahattā).* [1182]

Since the three lower saints do not regress, the Arahant cannot regress because it is he who has abandoned the most (*bahyutara*) of the afflictions (*kilesa*), who has best (*adhimatta*) practiced the Path (*maggabhāvanā),* who has best seen (*diṭṭha*) the Truths (*sacca*). Not only has the Arahant abandoned all the afflictions, but he has destroyed their roots (*ucchinnamūla*), he has made uprooted palm trees (*tālāvatthukata*) out of them, he has annihilated them (*anabhāvaṃkata*), he has made them things that will not be reborn *(āyatiṃanuppādadhamma*).

3. The Stream-enterer (*sotāpanna*) does not regress (*parihāyati*) from the fruit of Stream-entry (*sotāpattiphala*).[1183]

If the Stream-enterer regresses, he will be established (*saṇthāti*) on the level of worldly people (*puthjjanabhūmi*), which is impossible.

4. There is abiding in pure conduct (*brahmacariyavāsa*) among the Gods (*deva*).[1184]

The Gods are neither stupid (*jaḷa*), deaf-mute (*eḷamuga*), nor ignorant (*aviññu*), but they take pleasure (*pasanna*) in the Buddha, in the Dharma, in the Community by whom they are taught, and they commit neither wrong-deeds nor offences. Although there is no pure conduct among the Gods, nothing prevents some of them from adopting this good practice.

5. The afflictions (*kilesa*) are abandoned (*jahati*) one by one (*odhisodhiso*).[1185]

If the afflictions were abandoned progressively, one after another, one could be partially (*ekadesaṃ*) endowed with one or another of the fruits of sainthood (*sāmaññaphala*), which contradicts the Buddha's teachings.

6. The worldly person (*puthjjana*) abandons (*jahati*) neither the passion of desire (*kāmarāga*) nor malice (*byāpāda*).[1186]

When worldly people abandon desire and malice, they do so neither definitively (*accanataṃ)* nor completely (*anavasesaṃ).* This is what <213> distinguishes them from the saints, in particular the Non-returners (*anāgamī*). Moreover, worldly people do not abandon these defilements by the Path (*magga*) of the realm of form (*rūpāvacara*), for this path is salutary (*niyyānika*), leading to exhaustion (*khayagāmī*), leading to Awakening (*bodhagāmī*), pure (*anāsava*), stainless (*asaṇkilsika*), etc. They cannot attain the clear understanding of the Dharma *(dhammābhisamaya*) for, not having abandoned the majority of the fetters, they have not yet acquired the three lower fruits (*phala*). Furthermore, the Buddha declared that worldly teachers are not delivered (*aparimutta*) for they do not perceive (*ananubodha*), do not comprehend (*appaṭivedha*) noble (*ariya*) virtue (*sīla*), contemplation (*samādhi*), wisdom (*paññā)* or deliverance (*vimutti*).

7. The past (*atīta*) does not exist (*natthi*). The future (*anāgata*) does not exist.[1187]

[1182] Ibid., I, 2.
[1183] Ibid., I, 2.
[1184] Ibid., I, 3.
[1185] Ibid., I, 4.
[1186] Ibid., I, 5.
[1187] Ibid., I 6 and 7.

According to their very definition, past and future things do not exist: that which has ceased (*niruddha*) has gone (*vigata*), transformed (*vipariṇata*), disappeared (*atthaṇgata*), been wiped out (*abbhatthaṇgata*), can exist no more than that which has not yet been born (*ajāta*), not yet become (*abhūta*), not yet been created (*asañjata*), not yet been reborn (*anibbatta*), not yet been completely reborn (*anabhinibbatta*), not yet appeared (*apātubhūta*). The present, past and future must not be confused with the things which they affect, as the Sarvāstivādins seem to do. Indeed, when present matter, for example, ceases (*nirujjhamāna*), it abandons (*jahati*) its present nature (*paccuppannabhāva*) but it does not abandon its material nature (*rūpabhāva*). Therefore it cannot be said about present matter that in it matter and the present are identical (*ekaṭṭha*), the same (*sama*), equal (*samabhāga*), alike (*tajja*). This does not mean that matter never abandons its material nature for, if that were so, it would be like *nibbāna*, permanent (*nicca*), solid (*dhuva*), eternal (*sassata*) and not subject to the law of change (*avipaiṇāmadhamma*). Although the present and the future must abandon their nature of present or future, it is not the same as the past, for that which has passed remains ever past and therefore does not abandon its past nature while not being, like *nibbāna*, permanent, solid, eternal, etc. The perception or knowledge of an object is possible only if the various factors of this perception or knowledge, in particular the organ and the object, are present and consequently simultaneous. If past things existed, his past passions (*rāga*), hatreds (*dosa*), mistakes would exist in the Arahant and he would be defiled as before, which would be incompatible with his Arahant nature. Similarly, one would be able to use past hands, feet, water, fire, etc., which contradicts experience. Moreover, one would have three series of aggregates (*khandha*), spheres *(āyatana*), elements (*dhātu*), etc., one present, one past and one future, which is untenable. Finally, like their adversaries, the Theravādins cited some Suttas in support of their thesis. In the more conclusive of these Suttas, the Buddha declared that one should say about what has past: "It was (*ahosi*)" and not: "It is (*atthi*)" or "It will be (*bhavissati*)": about what is future, one should say: "It will be" and not: "It was" or "It is"; and about what is present, one should say: "It is" and not "It was" or "It will be".

8. It must not be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that a given (*ekacca*) past (*atīta*) exists (*atthi*), viz., the past things (*dhamma*) the maturation of which has not ripened (*avipakkavipāka*), and that a given past does not exist (*natthi*), viz., past things the maturation of which has ripened (*vipakkavipāka*). It must not be said either that a given future (*anāgata*) exists, viz., the things destined to be <214> produced (*uppādin*) that have not yet been born (*ajāta*), and that a given future does not exist, viz., the future things not destined to be produced (*anuppādin*) that have not been born.[1188]

This is a corollary of the preceding thesis.

9. All (*sabbe*) things (*dhamma*) are not the foundation of mindfulness (*satipaṭṭhāna*).[1189]

All things do not have – and far from it – the nature of foundations of mindfulness, i.e., mindulness (*sati*), faculty of mindfulness (*satindriya*),… pure (*anāsava*), without fetters (*asaññojaniya*), without knots (*aganthaniya*), etc. The reasoning used to support the opposite thesis can just as well show that everything is a support for contact (*phassapaṭṭhāna*) or a support for the mind (*cittapaṭṭhāna*).

[1188] Ibid., I, 8.
[1189] Ibid., I, 9.

10. It must not be said (*na vttabbaṃ*) that the past (*atīta*), future (*anāgata*), present (*paccupanna*), form (*rūpa*) and the other aggregates (*khandha*) truly (*heva*) exist (*santi*) and truly do not exist.[1190]
Existence (*atthibhāva*) and non-existence (*nattibhāva*) are not identical (*ekaṭṭha*), similar *(sama*), equal (*samabhāga*) and alike (*tajja*). Consequently, a given thing cannot both exist and not exist.

11. The Arahant is not seduced by another (*parūpahāra*).[1191]
The emission of impure sperm (*asucisukkavisaṭṭhi*) differs from the emission of the other impure bodily liquids, such as salive, tears, urine, etc., in that it is necessarily linked with an intense passion (*rāga*), namely lust (*kāma*), which is in contradiction with the moral nature of the Arahant, not just with his material nature. In fact, the passion of lust is a manifestly active affliction (*paryutthāna*) (outburst), a fetter (*saññojana*), a torrent (*ogha*), a yoke (*yoga*), an obstacle (*nīvaraṇa*), all things that a true Arahant must definitively abandon.

12. The Arahant has no ignorance (*aññāna*).[1192]
If the Arahant had ignorance, he would have non-knowledge (*avijjā).* But non-knowledge, the first link in the chain of interdepent origination (*paṭiccasamuppāda*) is a torrent (*ogha*), a yoke (*yoga*), a tendency (*anusaya*), a manifestly active defilement (*paryutthāna*), etc., all things that a true Arahant must have abandoned definitively. No matter how, the Arahant cannot be ignorant of the four Fruits of sainthood.

13. The Arahant has no doubt (*kaṇkhā*).[1193]
If the Arahant had doubts, then he would be uncertain (*vicikicchā*). But uncertainty is an obsession, a fetter, an obstacle, all things that a true Arahant must have abandoned definitively. Whatever it may be, the Arahant must not experience any doubt in regard to the four Fruits of sainthood.

14. The Arahant does not have any information coming from another (*paravitārana*).[1194]
If the Arahant were informed by another, he would be guided by another (*paraneyya*), he would have faith in another (*parapattiya*), he would be conditioned by another (*parapaccaya*), he would be dependent on another (*paṭibandhabhū*), he would not know (*na jānāti*), <215> he would not see (*na passati*), he would be disturbed (*sammūḷha*) and without discernment (*asampajāna*), all of which is contrary to the nature of Arahant. In any case, the Arahant is not instructed by another in regard to the four Fruits of sainthood.

15. There is no emission of voice (*vacībheda*) by the person who has entered into possession (*samāpanna*) of the Path (*magga*).[1195]
This exclamation is never produced (*sabbadā)* anywhere (*sabbattha*) by anyone (*sabbesaṃ)* in any of the absorptions (*samāpatti*). If the person who knows (*jānanta*) suffering (*dukkha*) were to cry out: "O suffering!", the person who knows the origin (*samudaya*) should cry out: "O origin!", the person who knows cessation should cry out: "O cessation!", and the person who knows the Path should cry out: "O Path!". But this is not so. Moreover, knowledge has the Truth as its domain (*saccagocara*) while the ear has

[1190] Ibid., I, 10.
[1191] Ibid., II, 1.
[1192] Ibid., II, 2.
[1193] Ibid., II, 3.
[1194] Ibid., II, 4.
[1195] Ibid., II, 5.

sound (*sota*) as its domain (*saddagocara*), which is quite different. Moreover, the Buddha said that for the person who has entered into possession of the first meditation (*jhāna*), speech (*vācā)* has ceased (*niroddha*); all the more reason that it is the same in the higher meditations.

16. The nutrient suffering (*dukkhāhāra*) is not a member of the Path (*maggaṇga*) included in the Path (*maggapariyāpanna*).[1196]

If the nutrient suffering were a member of the Path, all (*sabbe*) those who exclaim (*vācaṃ bhāsanti*) "O suffering!" (*dukkhanti*) would be cultivating (*bhāventi*) the Path (*magga*), in which case by exclaiming "O suffering!", stupid worldly people (*bālaputhijjana*), matricides (*mātughātaka*), parricides (*pitughātaka*), murderers of Arahants (*arahantaghātaka*), those who cause the Buddha's blood to flow (*ruhiruppādaka*), and schismatics (*saṇghabhedaka*) would be cultivating the Path.

17. One single (*eka*) mind (*citta*) cannot last (*tiṭṭhati*) for a day (*divasa*).[1197]

If a single mind lasted for a day, its time of production (*uppādakkhaṇa*) would last for half a day (*upaḍḍhadivasa*) and its time of decline would likewise last for half a day, which is impossible. Moreover, during one day (*ekāha*), other (*aññā*) things (*dhamma*) are frequently (*bahumpi*) produced (*uppajjitvā)* and cease (*nirujjhanti*) and thus would be more mobile (*lahuparivatta*) than the mind, which is contrary to the Buddha's teachings. The Buddha in fact said that he did not know (*nāhaṃ samanupassāmi*) any other thing (*aññā eka dhamma*) comparable (*upama*) to the mind in regard to mobility. He compared the mind to a monkey (*makkaṭa*) wandering (*caramāna*) in the forest (*araññā*) that grasps (*gaṇhāti*) one branch (*sākha*), then lets it go (*muñcitvā)* and grasps another, etc. And so, the mind that sees (*passati*) form (*rūpa*) through the intermediary of the eye (*cakkhu*) cannot be the mind that hears (*suṇāti*) sound (*sadda*) through the intermediary of the ear (*sota*), the mind that smells (*ghāyati*) odor (*gandha*) through the intermediary of the nose (*ghāna*), etc. The mind that makes one move forward (*abhikkamati*) is not the mind that makes one turn back (*paṭikkamati*) and vice versa, etc. Although among the Gods of the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*) a mind lasts for as long as a lifetime (*yāvatāyuka*), it is not the same for the other Gods and still less for humans.

18. It cannot be said that all (*sabba*) composite phenomena (*saṇkhāra*) are, without distinction, nothing but ashes (*kukkuḷa*).[1198] <216>

Since there are many kinds of pleasure (*sukha*), one cannot say that all composite phenomena are only suffering (*dukkha*). In several *Suttas*, the Buddha himself vouched for the existence of happiness and of things capable of producing happiness, desirable (*iṭṭha*) things, pleasant (*manāpa*) things, beloved (*kanta*) things, dear (*pīyarūpa*) things, fascinating (*rajaniya*) things accompanied by desire (*kāmūpasañhita*). Generosity (*dāna*), chastity (*brahmacariya*) and other pious actions produce happiness and not suffering.

19. The clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the four Paths (*magga*) and the four Truths (*sacca*) is not progressive (*anupubba*).[1199]

[1196] Ibid., II, 6.
[1197] Ibid., II, 7.
[1198] Ibid., II, 8.
[1199] Ibid., II, 9.

The Blessed One said: "O monks, at the moment when, for the noble Listener (*ariyasāvaka*) there is produced (*udapādi*) the dust-free (*viraja*) stainless (*vītamala*) Dharma eye (*dhammacakkhu*), everything that is (*yaṃ kiñci*) the Law of the origin (*samudayadhamma*) is the entire (*sabbantaṃ)* Law of cessation (*nirodhadhamma*). O monks, with the appearance of seeing (*dassanupāda*), three fetters (*saññojana*) of the noble Listener are abandoned (*pahiyanti*), namely, the view of the self (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi*), doubt (*vicikicchā)* and affectation of the virtue of ritualism (*sīlabbataparāmāsa*)." And also: "One is incapable (*abhabba*) of commiting (*kātsuṃ)* the six major misdeeds (*chakābhiṭṭhāna*) when one has achieved seeing (*dassanasampadāya*)." Moreover, if clear comprehension were progressive, one ought to gradually (*bhāveti*) develop each of the Paths leading to the fruits and, in that case, progressively experience (*sacchikaroti*) each of the four Fruits, which is inadmissible. If, on the other hand, the individual (*puggala*) who has attained (*paṭipanna*) the experience of any one of the four Fruits by the seeing of suffering (*dukkhadassana*) gradually abandoned (*jahati)* the defilements expelled by the attainment of this Fruit, if he abandoned them, then, by fourths (*catubhāga*) – each quarter being abandoned by the seeing of one of the four Truths – each Fruit ought to be itself divided into fourths and the degree of sainthood likewise correspondingly. But this is impossible for a quarter of an Arahant, for example, is not an Arahant since he does match the definition of Arahant. If clear understanding were progressive, the seeing of the first three Truths would be incomplete (*aparaniṭṭhita*) and it would not entitle one to the status of saint. Only the seeing of the fourth Truth would complete (*pariniṭṭhita*) and entitle one to this rank. The seeing of the first three Truths would therefore be useless (*niratthiya*) for acquiring the Fruits.

20. The speech (*vohāra*) of the Buddha is not supramundane (*lokuttara*).[1200]

If it were supramundane, only a supramundane ear (*sota*) could hear it, only a [supramundane] consciousness (*viññāṇa*) could understand it, which is contrary to the experience that people have had of it, since even the worldly people (*puthujjana*) have heard his speech and have understood it. Moreover, this speech does not have the properties of supramundane things, but rather those of mundane things, since people have a passion (*rajjeyyum*) for it, have found it pleasant (*kamaniya*), intoxicating (*madaniya*), sweet (*bandhaniya*), whereas others have hated it (*dusseyyuṃ)* and yet others, not understanding it, have found errors in it (*muyheyyuṃ).*

21. There is only one cessation (*nirodha*).[1201]

If there were two cessations, there would be two Truths of cessation <217> (*nirodhasacca*), hence two extinctions (*nibbāna*). But if there were two extinctions, one would be higher and one lower (*uccaniccatā),* one base and one excellent (*hinapanītatā),* etc., there would be a boundary (*sīmā)* between them, a break (*bheda*), a limit (*rājī*), an interval (*antarikā),* which is impossible.

22. The power (*bala*) of the Tathāgata is not shared with the Listeners (*sāvakasādhāraṇa*).[1202]

If the power of the Tathāgata were shared with the Listeners, the latter would have the ten supernatural knowedges of the Tathāgata and would be the same as him, which is impossible.

[1200] Ibid., II, 10.
[1201] Ibid., II, 11.
[1202] Ibid., III, 1.

23. The power of the Tathāgata that consists of the knowledge (*ñāṇa*) conforming with reality (*yathābhuta*) of what is possible and what is impossible *(ṭhānāṭhāna*) and the other powers are not noble (*ariya*). [1203]

In fact, this knowledge, one of the ten supernatural mental powers of the Tathāgata, does not enter into any of the categories of noble things, i.e., belonging to the Bodhisattvas, like the four Paths (*magga*) and the four Fruits (*phala*). It is the same for the other nine powers.

24. The mind (*citta*) provided with passions (*sarāga*) is not liberated (*vimuccati*).[1204]

It is not acceptable that the mind provided with passions, bad (*akusala*), worldly (*lokiya*), provided with impurities (*sāsava*), fetters (*saññojaniya*), knots (*ghanthaniya*),… defilements (*saṇkilesika*), is liberated. It is only the mind endowed with contact (*saphassa*), with perception (*sasaññā),* with volition (*sacetanā),* with wisdom (*sapaññā*) that can be liberated. Furthermore, if the mind provided with passions were liberated, passion (*rāga*) and the mind would both (*ubho*) be liberated, which is impossible.

25. Liberation (*vimutta*) is not liberating itself (*vimuccamāna*).[1205]

If liberation liberated itself, it would be partially (*ekadesaṃ)* liberated and partially non-liberated (*avimutta*), which is impossible. Ot else one could say that at the moment of production (*uppādakkhaṇe*) it is liberated, and at the moment it is disappearing (*vayakkhaṇe*), it is liberating itself, which is also untenable.

26. In the eighth (*aṭṭhamaka*) individual (*puggala*), there is no abandonment (*pahāna*) of the manifestly appearing afflictions (*paryuṭṭhāna*), of conceptual views (*diṭṭhi*) and of doubt (*vicikicchā*).[1206]

The eighth individual, i.e., the candidate for the fruit of Stream-entry (*sotāpattiphala*), since he is different from the latter, cannot yet abandon these two manifestly appearing afflictions. Besides, he has not yet cultivated (*bhāvita*) the Path (*magga*), which is necessary to realize this abandonment.

27. The eighth (*aṭṭhamaka*) individual *(puggala*) possesses the five faculties of faith (*saddhā),* energy *(viriya*), mindfulness (*sati*), meditation (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññā*).[1207]

Since the candidate for Stream-entry possesses faith, energy, mindfulness, meditation and wisdom, he possesses the five corresponding faculties which <218> are inseparable from them, just as, possessing mind (*mano*), cheerfulness (*somanassa*) and life, (*jīvita*), he possesses the mental faculties, cheerfulness and vitality.

28. The divine eye (*dibbacakkhu*) is not the fleshly eye (*maṃsacakkhu*) based on things (*dhammūpatthaddha*).[1208]

Indeed, if the divine eye were the fleshly eye, the fleshly eye would, vice versa, be the divine eye and all beings ought then to be endowed with supernatural vision, which obviously is wrong.

[1203] Ibid., III, 2.
[1204] Ibid., III, 3.
[1205] Ibid., III, 4.
[1206] Ibid., III, 5.
[1207] Ibid., III, 6.
[1208] Ibid., III, 7.

29. The divine ear (*dibbasota*) is not the fleshly ear (*maṃsasota*) based on things (*dhammūpatthaddha*).[1209]

30. The divine eye (*dibbacakkhu*) is not the knowledge of the specific results of actions (*yathākammūpagatañāṇa*).[1210]

31. Among the Gods there is no dicipline (*samvara).*[1211]

There is no discipline or non-discipline (*asaṃvara*) for they are not exposed to the same temptations as humans.

32. There is no perception (*saññā*) among the non-perceiving beings (*asaññasatta*).[1212]

Since perception is always accompanied by the other four aggregates and since the latter do not exist among the non-perceiving beings, the latter do not have any perception.

33. There is perception (*saññā*) in the realm without perception or non-perception (*nevasaññānā-saññāyatana*).[1213]

In this realm, four aggregates including the aggregate of perception make up the individual. Only the aggregate of form is missing.

34. The lay person (*gihī*) is never an Arahant.[1214]

The Arahant has definitively abandoned the fetters of the lay person (*gihisaññojana*). He has abandoned wedded life (*methuna dhamma*), family life (*puttasambādhasayana*), Benares sandalwood (*kṣikacandana*), unguents, perfumes and garlands (*mālāgandhavilepana*), gold and silver (*jātarūparajata*), etc., etc.

35. One does not become Arahant by being reborn (*upapattiya)* .[1215]

By being reborn, one does not acquire the fruit of Arahant but only the three lower fruits. There are no examples illustrating this case. The impurity of the mind of the person reborn prevents the acquisition of sainthood at this moment.

36. All (*sabbe*) the dharmas (*dhamma*) of the Arahant are not without impurities (*anāsrava*).[1216]

Indeed, the body of the Arahant is not without material impurities and cannot be put into any of the categories, all spiritual, of things without impurities.

37. The Arahant is not provided (*samannāgata*) with the four Fruits (*phala*).[1217]

If the Arahant were provided (*samannāgata*) with the four Fruits, he would, at the same time, be Sotāpanna, Sakadāgāmi, which is contradictory. For analogous reasons <219>, the Anāgāmi cannot be provided with either the first two fruits or the Sakadāgāmi of the former.

38. The Arahant is not provided with the six equanimities (*upekkhā*).[1218]

[1209] Ibid., III, 8.
[1210] Ibid., III, 9.
[1211] Ibid., III, 10.
[1212] Ibid., III, 11.
[1213] Ibid., III, 12.
[1214] Ibid., IV, 1.
[1215] Ibid., IV, 2.
[1216] Ibid., IV, 3.
[1217] Ibid., IV, 4.
[1218] Ibid., IV, 5.

39. It is not because of Awakening *(bodhi*) that one is Buddha.[1219]

The line of argument is very sophistic and rests on the distinction between past, future and present Awakening.

40. The Bodhisatta does not have the marks (*lakkhaṇa-samannāgata*) of the Great Man.[1220]

It is easy to show that, almost always, the nature of the Bodhisatta is different from that of the Cakkavattasatta.

41. The Bodhisatta, i.e., the future Buddha, Sakkamuṇi, did not become a practitioner of celibacy (*caritabrahmacariya*) nor was he brought to the assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*okkantaniyāma*) thanks to the sermons of the Bhagavant Kassapa, the previous Buddha.[1221]

If that were so, the future Buddha would have been a simple Listener (*sāvaka*) of Kassapa, which is contrary to the nature of a Buddha. In fact, one does not become Buddha by abandoning (*hutvā)* the state of Listener, but rather one is Buddha by oneself (*sayambhū*).

42. The person (*puggala*) who has attained (*paṭipanna*) the realization of sainthood (*arahattasacchikiriyā)* is not endowed with the three previous Fruits (*phala*).[1222]

43. Sainthood (*arahatta*) is not the abandonment (*pahāna*) of all the fetters (*sabbasaññojana*).[1223]

Actually, sainthood does not consist of abandoning all the fetters but rather those that have not yet been abandoned.

44. The person who has knowledge of liberation (*vimuttiñāṇa*) is not liberated (*vimutta*).[1224]

There are several kinds of knowledges of liberation and there is only one liberation worthy of the name, complete liberation.

45. The student (*sekkha*) does not have the knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the sage (*asekkha*).[1225]

It is essentially the nature of their knowledge that distinguishes the student from the sage. Therefore, if the former had the knowledge of the latter, he would be identical to him, which is inadmissible.

46. Absorption (*samāpatti*) based on the device of the earth (*paṭhavīkasiṇa*) does not produce a false (*viparīta*) knowledge (*ñāṇa*) in the person in absorption (*samāpanna*).[1226]

The absorption based thus is good (*kusala*) and does not take what is impermanent (*anicca*) as permanent (*nicca*), what is suffering (*dukkha*) as pleasant (*sukha*), what is non-self (*anattā)* as self (*attā),* what is horrible (*asubha*) as fine (*subha*). Moreover, the Arahant who uses this process of meditation <220> is not subject to mistakes of perception (*saññā),* of mind (*citta*) and of speculative view (*diṭṭhi*).

47. In the person who is not so destined (*aniyata*), there is no knowledge (*ñāṇa*) leading to assurance of the eventual attainment (*niyāmagamanā*) of the path of liberation, nor is there any knowledge leading to the absence of assutrance in the person who is determined.[1227]

[1219] Ibid., IV, 6.
[1220] Ibid., IV, 7.
[1221] Ibid., IV, 8.
[1222] Ibid., IV, 9. See the proof of thesis 37 above.
[1223] Ibid., IV, 10.
[1224] Ibid., V, 1.
[1225] Ibid., V, 2.
[1226] Ibid., V, 3.

48. All (*sabba*) knowledge (*ñāṇa*) is not analytical knowledge (*paṛisaṃbhidā*).[1228]

49. Relative knowledge (*sammatiñāṇa*) has only the Trtuth as object (*saccārammaṇañña*) and has no other object (*na aññārammaṇa*).[1229]

The knowledge resulting from the absorptions (*samāpatti*) based on the universalizing devices (*kasina*) and the knowledge of those who give alms (*dadanta*) of the necessities such as medicines and remedies for illnesses (*gilānapaccayabhesajjaparikkhāra*) are relative knowledges and yet they have as their only object the Truth.

50. It should not be said (*na vattabbaṃ*) that the knowledge (*ñāna*) of the way another thinks (*cetoparyāya*) has as object only the mind (*cittārammaṇañña*) and no other object (*na aññārammaṇa*).[1230]

Actually, by this knowledge one knows (*pajānāti*) that the mind of another is provided with or not provided with passion (*rāga*), hatred (*dosa*), error (*moha*), etc. Besides, the knowledges having contact (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* faith (*saddhā),* energy, (*viriya*), etc., as object are modes of knowledge of the mind of another.

51. There is no knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the future (*anāgata*).[1231]

There is no mode of knowledge that permits one to know the future and, in particular, of knowing whether one will obtain such and such of the four Fruits.

52. There is no knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the present (*paccuppanna*).[1232]

One cannot, by means of a consciousness, know (*pajānāti*) that one has a definite present knowledge, just as one cannot feel (*vedeti*) a certain sensation by means of a sensation (*vedanā)* or perceive (*sañjānāti*) a certain perception by means of a perception (*saññā),* etc.

53. The Listener (*sāvaka*) does not have knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the fruit (*phala*) attained by another.[1233]

54. Assurance of the eventual attainment of emlightenment (*niyāma*) is not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1234]

If the assurance were non-composite, it would be like extinction (*nibbāna*). Then there would be two extinctions, which is impossible (see line of argument for thesis 21). Moreover, the assurance does not have the characteristics of the non-composite since one enters into it (*okkamanti*), obtains it (*paṭilabhanti*), makes it arise (*uppādenti*), etc. On the other hand, if the assurance were non-composite, all the more reason the Path (*magga*) should be non-composite. Since the Path is fourfold, that would make five non-composites, along with extinction, therefore five extinctions, which is impossible as we have seen.

55. Interdependent arising (*paṭiccasamuppāda*) is not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1235] <221>

[1227] Ibid., V, 4.
[1228] Ibid., V, 5.
[1229] Ibid., V, 6.
[1230] Ibid., V, 7.
[1231] Ibid., V, 8.
[1232] Ibid., V, 9.
[1233] Ibid., V, 10.
[1234] Ibid., VI, 1.

Each of the members (*aṇga*) of interdependent arising is composite, therefore the group cannot be non-composite.

56. The four Truths (*sacca*) are not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1236]

Since suffering, the origin and the Path are composite, the Truths of suffering, of the origin and of the path cannot be non-composite.

57. The four formless absorptions *(ārūpyasamāpatti*) are not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1237]

58. The absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*) is not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1238]

59. Space *(ākāsa*) is not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1239]

In space, birds (*pakkhi*), the moon and the sun (*candimasuriyā)* and the celestial bodies (*tārakarūpa*) move about (*gacchanti*), magical transformations (*iddhiṃ vikubbanti*) occur, one moves (*cālenti*) one's arms (*bāhu*) and hands (*pāṇi*) about, one throws (*khipanti*) clods of earth (*leḍḍu*), sticks (*laguḷa*) and arrows (*usu*), all things that could not be done in the non-composite. Furthermore, by enclosing space, we build (*karenti*) houses (*ghara*) or monastic cells (*koṭṭha*); by digging (*khanamāna*) a well (*udapāna*) one causes what was not space (*anākāsa*) to become (*hoti*) space; by replacing (*pūriyamāna*) an empty well (*tuccha*) or an empty hole (*koṭṭha*) or an empty jar (*kumbhī*), one makes space disappear. Now, one can neither create the non-composite nor make it disappear.

60. Space *(ākāsa*) is invisible (*anidassana*).[1240]

Experience proves that space is not seen by the eye directly.

61. The earth element (*paṭhavīdhātu*), the elements of water *(āpodhātu*), fire (*tejodhātu*) and wind (*vāyodhātu*) are invisible (*anidassana*).[1241]

Experience proves that the four great elements are not seen directly by the eye.

62. The ocular faculty (*cakkhundriya*) is invisible (*anidassana*).[1242]

63. Physical action (*kāyakamma*) is invisible (*anidassana*).[1243]

64. There are things (*dhamma*) that are included (*saṇgahita*) in other things.[1244]

Thus, the sense spheres *(āyatana*) of form *(rūpa*), sound (*sadda*) smell (*gandha*) taste (*rasa*) and touchable (*phoṭṭhabba*) are included in the aggregate of form (*rūpakkhandha*).

65. There are things (*dhamma*) that are associated (*saṃpayutta*) with other things.[1245]

Thus, the aggregate of feeling (*vedanākkhanda*) which is linked (*sahajāta*) with the aggregate of perception (*saññākkhandha*) is linked with it.

66. There are mental (*cetasika*) things (*dhamma*).[1246]

[1235] Ibid., VI, 2. See also the line of aregument for thesis 21.
[1236] Ibid., VI, 3. See argument for thesis 21.
[1237] Ibid., VI, 4. See argument for theses 21 and 54.
[1238] Ibid., VI, 5. See argument for theses 21 and 54.
[1239] Ibid., VI, 6. See also argument for thesis 21.
[1240] Ibid., VI, 7.
[1241] Ibid., VI, 8.
[1242] Ibid., VI, 9.
[1243] Ibid., VI, 10.
[1244] Ibid., VII, 1.
[1245] Ibid., VII, 2.

These are things coexistent (*sahajāta*) with the mind (*citta*), associated <222> (*saṃpayutta*) with it, like contact (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* intention (*cetanā),* faith (*saddhā),* energy (*viriya*), etc.

67. Generosity (*dāna*) is not a mental (*cetasika*) thing (*dhamma*).[1247]

Actually, generosity consists only of material things like food, clothing, medicines, etc. and not of mental things like contact (*phassa*), perception (*saññā),* intention (*cetanā),* faith (*saddhā),* wisdom (*paññā),* etc..

68. That which consists of enjoyment (*paribhogamaya*) does not increase merit (*puṇṇa*).[1248]

There is no merit for the person who gives a gift (*dāna*), e.g., without reflecting on it (*asamannāhāranta*), without thinking of it (*acetayanta*), without wanting it (*apatthayanta*), without desiring it (*appaṇidahanta*), or else no merit for the one who makes a gift with examination (*vitakka*) based on malice (*byāpāda*), on harm (*vihiṃsā).* On the other hand, there is merit if, the gift having been given and having been accepted, the person who has received it does not enjoy it because he vomits it (*chaḍḍeti*) or rejects it (*visaajjeti*), or the king (*rājā)* or thieves (*cora*) take it (*haranti*), or fire (*aggi*) consumes it (*dahati*), or water (*udaka*) carries it away (*vahati*), etc.

69. One does not protect oneself (*yāpenti*) up above (*tattha*) by means of what has been given (*dibba*) down below (*ito*).[1249]

It is obvious that one cannot enjoy in another existence things that one has given in this existence. Besides, one is not the agent (*kāraka*) of another's (*añña*) actions, one does not produce the pleasure and pain (*sukhadukkha*) created by another (*parakata*), and one does not feel the effects (*paṭisaṃvedeti*) of them.

70. The earth (*paṭhavī*) is not the maturation of action (*kammavipāka*).[1250]

The earth is not associated (*saṃpayutta*) either with feelings (*vedanā)* that are pleasant (*sukha*) or unpleasant (*dukkha*) or neither pleasant nor unpleasant, or with contact (*phassa*) or with perception (*saññā)* or with intention (*cetanā)* or with mind (*citta*). It is not provided with object (*sārammana*), it does not produce either a call for attention *(āvajjana*) or thought *(ābhoga*) or reflection (*samannāhāra*) or attentiveness (*manasikāra*) or intention or aspiration (*patthanā)* or resolution (*paṇidhi*). Moreover, it is shared (*sādhāraṇa*) with others (*para*) whereas the maturation of action is specific.

71. Old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*) are not maturation (*vipāka*).[1251]

Same proof as preceding. Furthermore, the old age and death of good (*kusala*) or bad (*akusala*) things (*dhamma*) are always bad.

72. There is maturation of noble things (*ariyadhmmavipāka*).[1252]

The great fruit (*mahāphala*) is the religious life (*sāmañña*) and the pure life (*brahmañña*). Moreover, being fruits of generosity (*dāna*), virtue (*sīla*) and practice (*bhāvanā),* fruits are maturation.

[1246] Ibid., VII, 3.
[1247] Ibid., VII, 4.
[1248] Ibid., VII, 5.
[1249] Ibid., VII, 6.
[1250] Ibid., VII, 7.
[1251] Ibid., VII, 8.
[1252] Ibid., VII, 9.

73. Maturation (*vipāka*) is not a phenomenon of the law of maturation (*vipākadhammadhamma*).[1253]

If maturation were at the same time a cause of maturation, there would be neither an end (*antakiriyā)* to suffering (*dukkha*) nor an interruption of the cycle (*vaṭṭūpaccheda*) <223> of existences nor complete and definitive extinction (*anupādāparinibhbāna*). Moreover, the mind by means of which one destroys the life (*pāṇa*) of another would be the same as that by means of which one is cooked (*paccat*i) in hell (*niraya*), and the mind by means of which one makes a gift (*dānaṃ deti*) would be the same as that by means of which one rejoices (*modati*) in heaven (*sagga*).

74. There are only five (*pañca*) destinies (*gati*).[1254]

Actually, the Buddha taught only five destinies. Moreover, the Kālakañjika Asuras have the same color (*samānavaṇṇa*), same nourishment (*samānabhoga*), same foods (*samānāhāra*), same length of life (*samānāyuka*) as the Petas with whom, besides, they intermarry *(āvāhavivāhaṃ gacchanti*). As for the Vepacittiparisas, they have the same color, same nourishment, same foods, same length of life as the Gods, with whom they intermarry.

75. There is no intermediary existence (*antarābhava*).[1255]

The intermediary existence is not included in the three kinds of existence recognized by the Buddha and corresponding to the three worlds of the Buddhist cosmology, nor between (*antara*) any two of these three kinds of existence, nor in the various destinies (*gati*), wombs (*yoni*) etc., recognized by Scripture. Moreover, there are neither actions (*kamma*) nor beings (*satta*) coming close to (*upaga*) the intermediary existence. In the latter, beings are not born (*jāyanti*) nor do they grow old (*jiyyanti*) or die (*miyyanti*) or transmigrate (*cavanti*), nor are they reborn (*upapajjanti*), nor do they possess the five aggregates. Finally, the Antarāparinibbāyī is an Anāgamī who is completely extinguished, not in the intermediary existence, but in the middle (*antarā)* of a life in some heaven.

76. The five qualities of lust (*kāmaguṇa*) alone (*eva*) do not constitute the realm of desire (*kāmadhātu*).[1256]

In the realm of desire, there is still the will (*chanda*), passion (*rāga*), intention (*saṇkappa*), joy (*pīti*), happiness (*somanassa*) associated with it *(tappaṭisaṃpayutta*). There are still the eyes (*cakkhu*), ears (*sota*) … mind (*mano*) of people (*manussa*), their existence (*bhava*), their destiny (*gati*) in which they are born (*jāyanti*), grow old *(jiyyanti*), die (*miyyanti*), transmigrate (*cavanti*), are reborn (*upapajjanti*), etc.

77. The five sense spheres (*pañcevāyatanā)* do not constitute lust (*kāma*).[1257]

Same proof as preceding.

78. Material (*rūpī*) things (*dhamma*) do not constitute the material realm (*rūpadhātu*).[1258]

Same proof as preceding.

[1253] Ibid., VII, 10.
[1254] Ibid., VIII, 1.
[1255] Ibid., VIII, 2.
[1256] Ibid., VIII, 3.
[1257] Ibid., VIII, 4.
[1258] Ibid., VIII, 5.

79. Non-material (*arūpī*) things (*dhamma*) do not constitute the non-material realm (*arūpadhātu*).[1259]

Same proof as preceding.

80. In the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*), the individual (*attabhāva*) is not constituted by the six sense spheres (*saḷāyatana*).[1260]

If the individuality of the beings of the form realm consisted of the six sense spheres, the corresponding six objective spheres would also have to exist in this realm <224> as well as the [corresponding] forms, sounds, smells, tastes, touchables and ideas. Therefore the five sense spheres do not exist in this realm.

81. There is no matter (*rūpa*) in the non-material (*arūpa*).[1261]

The nature of the non-material and the material are completely incompatible.

82. Bodily action (*kāyakarman*) that has the good (*kusala*) mind (*citta*) as its origin (*samuṭṭhita*) is not good form (*rūpa*).

Form is without object (*anārammaṇa*); it does not produce either a call for attention *(āvajjanā)* or ideation *(ābhoga*) or reflection (*samannāhāra*) or attentiveness (*manasaikāra*) or intention (*cetanā)* or aspiration (*patthamā)* or resolution (*paṇidhi*).

83. The vital faculty (*jīvitindriya*) is not exclusively non-material (*arūpa*).[1262]

Material (*rūpī*) things (*dhamma*) also have longevity *(āyu*), duration *(ṭhiti*), continuation (*yapanā),* extension (*yāpanā*), progress (*iriyanā),* existence (*vattanā),* preservation (*pālanā).*

84. The Arahant does not regress (*parihāyati*) from sainthood (*arahatta*) due to actions (*kammahetu*). [1263]

85. For the person who sees benefit *(ānisaṃsadassāvī*), there is no abandoning (*pahāna*) of the fetters (*saññõjana*).[1264]

Only the person who pays attention (*manasi karoti*) to the impermanence (*anicca*) of the composites (*saṇkhāra*), to their suffering (*dukkh*a), to their diseases (*roga*), to their swellings (*gaṇḍa*), to their emptiness (*suñña*), to their absence of self (*anatta*), to their law of change (*vipariṇāmadhamma*) can abandon the fetters.

86. The fetters (*saññojana*) do not have immortality (*amatārammaṇa*) as object.[1265]

Actually, the immortal, i.e., *nibbāna*, has no relationship of any kind with fetters.

87. Form (*rūpa*) is without object (*anārammaṇa*).[1266]

Form does not produce a call for attention *(āvajjanā),* or ideation *(ābhoga*) or reflection (*samannāhāra*) or attentiveness (*manasikāra*) or ontention (*cetanā)* or aspiration (*patthanā)* or resolution (*paṇidhi*).

88. The latent tendencies (*anusaya*) have object (*sārammaṇa*).[1267]

[1259] Ibid., VIII, 6.
[1260] Ibid., VIII, 7.
[1261] Ibid., VIII, 8 and XVI, 9.
[1262] Ibid., VIII, 9.
[1263] Ibid., VIII, 10. See above thesis 2.
[1264] Ibid., IX, 1.
[1265] Ibid., IX, 2.
[1266] Ibid., IX, 3.

The latent tendencies do not fall into the categories of things without object (*anārammaṇa*), i.e., form (*rūpa*) and *nibbāna*. Furthermore, they are identical to the actively manifest afflictions (*paryutthanā),* the fetters (*saññojana*), the torrents (*ogha*), etc., which all have objects. Finally, they are included in the aggregate of mental formations (*saṇkhārakkhandha*) which is entirely provided with object.

89. Knowledge (*ñāṇa*) has an object (*sārammaṇa*).[1268]

90. The mind that has the past as object (*atītarammaṇa*) has an object (*sārammaṇa*).[1269] <225>

The mind that has taken the past (*atīta*) as object *(ārabbha*) makes a call for attention *(āvajjanā),* … and resolution (*paṇidhi),* therefore it has an object.

91. The mind (*citta*) that takes the future (*anāgatārammaṇa*) has an object (*sārammaṇa*).[1270]

Same proof as preceding.

92. All (*sabbe*) minds (*citta*) are not subject to examination (*vitakkānupatita*).[1271]

There are meditations (*samādhi*) without examination (*avitakka*) and also without reflection (*avicāra*).

93. Sound (*sadda*) is not the dissemination of examination (*vitakkavipphāra*) everywhere (*sabbaso*) after examination (*vitakkato*) and after reflection (*vicārato*).[1272]

94. The voice (*vācā)* can be in harmony with the mind (*yathācitta*). [1273]

95. Bodily action (*kāyakarman*) can be in harmony with the mind *(yathācitta*).[1274]

96. One does not have (*sammanāgata*) either the past (*atīta*) or the future (*anāgata*).[1275]

In fact, the past no longer exists and the future does not yet exist.

97. As long as the five aggregates (*khandha*) seeking to be reborn (*upapattesiya*) have not yet ceased (*niruddha*), the five active (*kiriya*) aggregates are not produced (*uppajjanti*).[1276]

If it were otherwise, there would be ten aggregates in all (*samodhāna*) conflicting (*sammukhībhāva*) with one another.

98. The form (*rūpa*) of the one who is endowed with the Path (*maggasamaṇgī*) is not path (*magga*).[1277]

The path has (*sārammaṇa*) object, and form, which does not have an object, cannot be Path.

99. There is no development of the Path (*maggabhāvanā)* in the one who is endowed with the five sense consciousnesses (*pañcaviññāṇasamaṇgī*).[1278]

The five sense consciousnesses have objects *(ārammaṇa*) and objective areas (*vatthu*) previously produced (*uppanna*) and arisen (*purejāta*), internal (*ajjhattika*) objective areas and external (*bāhira*) objects, unmixed

---

[1267] Ibid., IX, 4.
[1268] Ibid., IX, 5.
[1269] Ibid., IX, 6.
[1270] Ibid., IX, 7.
[1271] Ibid., IX, 8.
[1272] Ibid., IX, 9.
[1273] Ibid., IX, 10.
[1274] Ibid., IX, 11.
[1275] Ibid., IX, 12.
[1276] Ibid., X, 1.
[1277] Ibid., X, 2.
[1278] Ibid., X. 3.

(*asambhinna*) and varied (*nānā)* objective areas and objects. They do not have as object either emptiness (*suññatā),* the past (*atīta*), the future (*anāgata*), contact (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* intention (*cetanā)* or the mind (*citta*).

100. The five sense consciousnesses (*pañcaviññāṇa*) are neither good (*kusala*) nor bad (*akusala*).[1279]

Same proof as before.

101. The five sense consciousnesses are without ideation (*anābhoga*). [1280]

Same proof as before.

102. The one who is endowed with the Path (*maggasamaṇgī*) is not provided <226> (*samannāgata*) with two qualities (*sīla*), the one mundane (*lokiya*), the other supramundane (*lokuttara*). [1281]

Neither is he provided with two qualities of the two contacts (*phass*a), two feelings (*vedanā),* two faiths (*saddhā)*, two wisdoms *(paññā),* etc. Moreover, if he is provided with the mundane quality, he becomes an oridinary person (*puthujjana*), which he no longer is.

103. Virtue (*sīla*) is mental (*cetasika*). [1282]

It is not in any of the non-mental categories (*acetasika*) such as form (*rūpa*) and *nibbāna*, but it involves mental things such as feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* faith (*saddhā),* wisdom (*paññā),* etc. Moreover, virtue is a desirable fruit (*iṭṭhaphala*) and is provided with fruit (*saphala)* and maturation (*savipāka*).

104. Virtue (*sīla*) is a result of the mind (*cittānuparivatti*).[1283]

Same proof as before.

105. Virtue (*sīla*) caused by resolution (*samādānahetuka*) does not increase (*vaḍḍhati*).[1284]

Neither does the contact (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* faith (*saddhā),* wisdom (*paññā)* caused by resolution increase. Furthermore, there cannot be two virtues, one that increases, the other that does not increase, for two things (*dhamma*) of the same category, virtue, contact, feeling, perception, faith, wisdom, etc., cannot co-exist.

106. Information (*viññatti*) is not exclusively virtue (*sīla*).[1285]

Information can actually be criminal.

107. Non-information (*aviññatti*) is not exclusively immoral (*dussīlya*).[1286]

Experience proves this.

108. The latent dispositions (*anusaya*) are bad (*akusala*), provided with causes (*sahetuka*) and associated with the mind (*cittasaṃpayutta*).

[1279] Ibid., X, 4.
[1280] Ibid., X, 5.
[1281] Ibid., X, 6.
[1282] Ibid., X, 7.
[1283] Ibid., X, 8.
[1284] Ibid., X, 9.
[1285] Ibid., X, 10.
[1286] Ibid., XI, 1.

The latent dispositions are bad without exception because they are identical with the manifestly active defilements (*paryutthāna*), the fetters (*saññojana*), the torrents (*ogha*), etc., which are bad by nature. Moreover, they are not part of the indeterminate things (*abyākata*), i.e., form (*rūpa*) and *nibbāna*. For the same reasons, they have causes and are associated with the mind. Besides, they are included (*pariyāpanna*) in the aggregate of mental formations (*saṇkhārakkhandha*) which is completely associated with the mind.

109. Ignorance (*aññāṇa*) having been expelled *(vigata)* and the mind (*citta*) resting (*vattamāna*) dissociated from knowledge (*ñāṇavippayutta*), this state can be called (*vattabba*) 'knower' (*ñāṇī*).[1287]

Just as when passion (*rāga*), hetred (*dosa*), delusion (*moha*), the afflictions (*kilesa*) are expelled, such states are called, respectively, free of the passions (*vītarāga*), without hatred (*adosa*), without delusion (*amoha*), without <227> afflictions (*nikkilkesa*), when ignorance is expelled, such a state is called 'without ignorance', i.e., knower.

110. Knowledge (*ñāṇa*) is associated with the mind (*cittasaṃpayutta*).[1288]

It does not belong to any of the categories of things dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*), i.e., form (*rūpa*) and *nibbāna*, but involves the existence of things associated with the mind, such as wisdom (*paññā).* Moreover, it is included in the aggregate of mental formations (*saṇkhārakkhandhapariyāpanna*), which is essentially associated with the mind.

111. By saying (*bhāsant*) the words (*vācā*): "This (*idaṃ*) is suffeing", the knowledge (*ñāṇa*): "This is suffering" does not appear (*pavattati*).[1289]

The words: "This is origin (*samudaya*). This is cessation (*nirodha*). This is Path (*magga*)" do not make the knowledge of the other three Truths appear. Consequently, the words: "This is suffering" do not make the knowledge of suffering appear.

112. By means of supernatural power (*iddhibala*), the one who is endowed (*samannāgata*) [with the Path] cannot last for a cosmic eon.[1290]

The longevity *(āyu*), destiny (*gati*), obtaining individuality (*attabhāvapaṭilābdha*) do not consist of supernatural powers (*iddhimayika*). By means of supernatural power, one can only obtain that the five aggregates, once produced (*upanna*) are not destroyed (*niruddha*) or that they be permanent (*nicca*).

113. Contemplation (*samādhi*) is not the continuity of the mind (*cittasantati*).[1291]

If contemplation were the continuity of the mind, it would extend through the past (*atīta*) and the future (*anāgata*) which do not exist and also will not exist. Moreover, it would be bad (*akusala*), accompanied (*sahāgata*) by passion (*rāga*), hatred (*dosa*), delusion (*moha*), etc.

114. The stability of things (*dhammaṭṭhitatā)* is not complete (*parinipphanna*).[1292]

[1287] Ibid., XI, 2.
[1288] Ibid., XI, 3.
[1289] Ibid., XI, 4.
[1290] Ibid., XI, 5.
[1291] Ibid., XI, 6.
[1292] Ibid., XI, 7.

If it were otherwise, one could not put an end (*antakiriyā)* to suffering (*dukkha*), there would be no interruption of the cycle (*vaṭṭūpadccheda*) of rebirths, there would be no complete and definitive extinction (*anupādāparinibbāna*).

115. Impermanence (*aniccatā),* old age *(jarā)* and death (*maraṇa*) are not complete (*parinipphanna*).[1293]

Same proof as preceding.

116. Discipline (*saṃvara*) and non-discipline (*asaṃvara*) are not actions (*kamma*).[1294]

Neither the discipline nor the non-discipline of the eye faculty (*cakkhundriya*), ear (*sotindriya*), nose (*ghānindriya*), tongue (*jivhindriya*), bodily (*kāyindriya*) and mental (*manindriya*) faculties constitutute eye, ear, nose, tongue, bodily and mental actions.

117. All (*sabba*) action (*kamma*) is not endowed with maturation (*savipāka*).[1295]

Intention (*cetanā*), indeterminate (*abyākata*) as to maturation (*vipāka*) <228> or as to action (*kiriyā),* is without maturation (*avipāka*), therefore actions without maturation do exist.

118. Sound (*sadda*) is not maturation (*vipāka*).[1296]

Sound is not associated (*saṃpayutta*) with pleasant (*sukha*) or painful (*dukkha*) or neither pleasant nor painful feelings (*vedanā*); it is without object (*anārammaṇa*) and it does not produce either a call for attention *(āvajjanā)* or a resolution (*paṇidhi*), etc.

119. The six sense spheres (*saḷāyatana*) are not maturation (*vipāka*).[1297]

Same proof as preceding.

120. The individual (*puggala*) who should be reborn seven times at most (*sattakkhattuṃparama*) is not destined (*niyata*) to be reborn seven times at most.[1298]

The Sotāpanna can perform wrong deeds which will oblige him to be reborn more than seven times or else, thanks to intense efforts, he can succeed in being reborn less than seven times.

121. The individual (*puggala*) who goes from family to family (*kolaṃkola*) is not destined (*niyata*) to the necessity of going from family ro family.[1299]

122. The individual (*puggala*) endowed with [right] view (*diṭṭhisampanna*) cannot intentionally (*sañcicca*) deprive (*voropeyya*) a living being (*pāṇa*) of his life (*jīvita*).[1300]

123. In the individual (*puggala*) endowed with [right] view (*diṭṭhisampanna*), the bad destinies (*duggati*) are not abandoned (*pahīna*).[1301]

Indeed, he can become impassioned (*rajjeyya*) with a form (*rūpa*), sound (*sadda*), smell (*gandha*), taste (*rasa*), touch (*phoṭṭhabba*) linked with misfortune *(āpāyika*), he can engage (*paṭiseveyya*) in sexual

[1293] Ibid., XI, 8.
[1294] Ibid., XII, 1.
[1295] Ibid., XII, 2.
[1296] Ibid., XII, 3.
[1297] Ibid., XII, 4.
[1298] Ibid., XII, 5.
[1299] Ibid., XII, 6.
[1300] Ibid., XII, 7.
[1301] Ibid., XII, 8.

relations (*methuna dhamma*) with non-human females (*amanussitthī*), female animals (*tiracchānagatthī*) or the daughters of Nāgas (*nāgakaññā*), he can accept (*paṭiggaṇheyya*) goats and sheep (*ajeḷaka*), cocks and pigs (*kukkuṭasūkara*), elephants, cows, stallions and mares (*hatthigavassavaḷavā),* partridges, quails, peacocks, francolins (*tittiravaṭṭhakamorakapiñjala*), all things that monks must not possess.

124. The bad destinies (*duggati*) have been abandoned in the person (*puggala*) who has reached the seventh lifetime (*sattamabhavika*).[1302]

125. The one who must last a cosmic eon (*kappaṭṭha*) cannot last (*tiṭṭheyya*) a cosmic eon (*kappa*).[1303]

126. He who must last a cosmic eon (*kappaṭṭha*) can obtain (*paṭilabheyya*) a good (*kusala*) mind (*citta*).[1304]

He can make a gift (*dānaṃ dadeyya*), worship (*vandeyya*) a shrine (*cetiya*), thus he can obtain a good mind.

127. The person (*puggala*) attached to an immediate destiny (*anantarāpayutta*) cannot enter into the assurance of eventual attainment of enlightenment (*sammattaniyāma*).[1305] <229>

128. The assured one (*niyata*) does not enter into assurance (*niyāma*).[1306]

129. The one who comes up against obstacles (*nīvuta*) does not abandon (*jahati*) the obsracles (*nīvaraṇa*).[1307]

The passionate person (*ratta*) does not abandon passion (*rāga*), the hateful person (*duṭṭha*) does not abandon hatred (*dosa*), the disturbed person (*muṭṭha*) does not abandon delusion *(moha*), the defiled person (*kiliṭṭha*) person does not abandon the afflictions (*kilesa*).

130. The person who is confronted (*sammukhībhūta*) [with the fetters] does not abandon (*jahati*) the fetters (*saññõjana*).[1308]

Same proof as preceding.

131. The person who is in absorption (*samāpanna*) does not savor (*assādeti*), does not desire meditation (*jhānanikanti*), does not have meditation as object (*jhānārammana*).[1309]

A meditation cannot take itself as object, just as a touch (*phassa*) cannot touch (*phusati*) itself, a feeling (*vedanā)* cannot feel (*vedeti*) itself, a perception (*saññā)* cannot perceive (*sañjānāti)* itself.

132. There is no passion for the unpleasant (*asātarāga*).[1310]

There are no beings (*satta*) who enjoy suffering (*dukkhābhinandī*), who aspire (*patthenti*) to suffering (*dukkha*), who envy it (*pihenti*), who seek it out (*esenti*), etc.

133. Craving for mental phenomena (*dhammataṇhā)* is bad (*akusala*).[1311]

[1302] Ibid., XII, 9.
[1303] Ibid., XIII, 1.
[1304] Ibid.,XIII, 2.
[1305] Ibid., XIII, 3.
[1306] Ibid., XIII, 4.
[1307] Ibid., XIII, 5.
[1308] Ibid., XIII, 6.
[1309] Ibid., XIII, 7.
[1310] Ibid., XIII, 8.
[1311] Ibid., XIII, 9.

It is not in any of the categories of indeterminate things (*abyākata*). Like the craving for forms (*rūpataṇhā),* sounds (*saddataṇhā),* smells (*gandhataṇhā*), tastes (*rasataṇhā),* touchables (*phoṭṭhabbataṇhā),* it is bad, for all craving (*taṇhā),* being greed (*lobha*), is bad, as the Buddha has taught.

134. The craving for mental phenomena (*dhammataṇhā)* is the origin of suffering (*dukkhasamudaya*).[1312]

All craving (*taṇhā)* being greed (*lobha*), it is the origin of suffering.

135. The root of the bad (*akusalamūla*) and the root of the good (*kusalamūla*) are not adjusted (*paṭisandahanti*) reciprocally.[1313]

The good and the bad are not produced under the same conditions.

136. The six sense spheres (*saḷāyatana*) are not established (*saṇṭhāti*) simultaneously (*apubbaṃ acarimaṃ)* in the mother's womb (*mātukucchi*).[1314]

137. The auditory consciousness (*sotaviññaṇa*) is not produced immediately after (*anantarā)* the visual consciousness (*cakkuviññāṇa*) and, in general, the five sense consciousnesses are not produced immediately one after the other.[1315]

They are not produced under the same conditions for they have different objects. <230>

138. Noble form (*ariyarūpa*) is not derived (*upādāya*) from the great elements (*mahābhūta*).[1316]

Noble form is good (*kusala*), without impurities (*anāsava*), fetters (*asaññojaniya*), knots (*aganthaniya*), defilements (*asaṇkilasika*), etc., whereas the great elements are indeterminate (*abyākata*), have impurities (*sāsava*), fetters (*saññojaniya*), knots (*ganthaniya*), defilements (*saṇkilesika*), etc.

139. The latent dispositions (*anusaya*) are not different from the manifestly active afflictions (*pariyuṭṭhāna*).[1317]

The latent dispositions and the active afflictions have the same species: passion of lust (*kāmarāga*), of hatred (*paṭigha*), of pride (*māna*), etc. But *kāmarāga*, for example, can only be identical with *kāmarāganusaya* and *kāmarāgapariyuṭṭhāna*. Therefore the latent dispostion of *kāmarāga* is the same as the manifestly active *kāmarāga* and, in general, the latent dispositions are the same as the manifestly active afflictions.

140. The manifestly active afflictions (*pariyuṭṭhāna*) are associated with the mind (*cittasaṃpayutta*).[1318]

The manifestly active afflictions do not fall into any of the categories of things dissociated from the mind (*cittavippayutta*), i.e., form (*rūpa*) and *nibbāna*. Furthermore, threre are bad (*kusala*), passionate (*sarāga*), hateful (*sadosa*), deluded (*samoha*) and defiled (*saṇkiliṭṭha*) minds (*citta*).

[1312] Ibid., XIII, 10.
[1313] Ibid., XIV, 1.
[1314] Ibid., XIV, 2.
[1315] Ibid., XIV, 3.
[1316] Ibid., XIV, 4.
[1317] Ibid., XIV, 5.
[1318] Ibid., XIV, 6.

141. The passion for form (*rūparāga*) does not reside (*anusati*) only in the form realm (*rūpadhātu*), is not included only in the form realm (*rūpadhātupariyāpanna*). The passion for the formless (*arūparāga*) does not reside only in the formless realm (*arūpadhātu*), is not included only in the formless realm (*arūpadhātupariyāpanna*).[1319]

142. The conceptual view (*diṭṭhigata*) is bad (*akusala*).[1320]

It is not included in any of the catgories of indeterminate (*abyākata*) things, but involves bad things such as wrong view (*micchādiṭṭhi*).

143. The conceptual view (*diṭṭhigata*) is included (*pariyāpanna*) in the three worlds.[1321]

It is not included in any of the categories of things that are not included (*apariyāpanna*) in the threefold world, such as *nibbāna*, the Path (*magga*) and its Fruits (*phala*).

144. Causality (*paccayatā)* is not determinate (*vivatthita*).[1322]

Thus, experience (*paccayatā)* is both cause (*hetupaccaya*) and dominant condition (*adhipatipaccaya*), inclination (*chanda*) is both dominat condition and co-arisen cause (*sahajātapaccaya*), etc.

145. The mental formations (*saṇkhāra*) are conditioned by ignorance (*avijjāpaccaya*) and vice versa, ignorance (*avijjā)* is conditioned by the mental formations (*saṇkhārapaccaya*).

Ignorance is actually co-existent (*sahajāta*) with the mental formations. [1323] <231> It is the same for the other members (*aṇga*) of the chain of dependent formation (*paṭiccasamuppāda*) in both directions.

146. The divisions of time (*addhā)* are not complete (*parinipphanna*).[1324]

The past *(atīta*), future (*anāgata*) and present (*paccuppanna*) are not complete. There are not five past (*atīta*) aggregates, five other future aggregates and five other present aggregates, but just five aggregates that were, are and will be. The three divisions of time thus are not realities independent from one another.

147. The instant (*khaṇa*), moment (*laya*) and second (*muhutta*) are not complete (*parinipphanna*).[1325]

Same proof as above.

148. The four impurities *(āsava*) are provided with impurities (*sāsava*).[1326]

149. The old age and death (*jarāmaraṇa*) of supramundane (*lokuttara*) things are not supramundane.[1327]

They do not fall into any of the supramundane categories.

150. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that the absorption of cessation of feeling and perception (*saññāvedayitanirodhasamāpatti*) is supramundane (*lokuttara*) or mundane (*lokiya*).[1328]

[1319] Ibid., XIV, 7 and XVI, 10.
[1320] Ibid., XIV, 8.
[1321] Ibid., XIV, 9.
[1322] Ibid., XV, 1.
[1323] Ibid., XV, 2.
[1324] Ibid., XV, 3.
[1325] Ibid., XV, 4.
[1326] Ibid., XV, 5.
[1327] Ibid., XV, 6.
[1328] Ibid., XV, 7 and 8.

151. The person who is absorbed (*saṃāpanna*) in the cessation of feeling and perception (*saññāvedayitanirodha*) cannot die (*kākam kareyya*).[1329]

He has no touch (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* intention (*cetanā)* or mind (*citta*), therefore he cannot die. Moreover, absorbed in the supreme meditation, he cannot be killed by poison (*visa*), the sword (*sattha*) or fire (*aggi*).

152. Non-perception beings (*asaññasattūpika*) are not associated with the absorption of cessation of feeling and perception (*saṇṇāvedayitanirodhasamāpatti*).[1330]

In the one who has attained this absorption, there are neither the three roots of good (*kusalamūla*) of absence of greed (*alobha),* absence of hatred (*adosa*) and absence of delusion (*amoha*), nor exertion (*viriya*), nor mindfulness (*sati*), nor meditation (*samādhi*), nor wisdom (*paññā),* nor contact (*phassa*), nor feeling (*vedanā),* nor perception (*saññā),* nor intention (*cetanā),* nor mind (*citta*); there is therefore no further development of the path (*maggabhāvanā).*

153. Action (*kamma*) is not different (*aññа*) from the accumulation of action (*kammūpacaya*).[1331]

The accumulation of something, contact (*phassa*), feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* wisdom (*paññā)*, is not different from this thing.

154. One (*para*) does not control (*niggaṇhāti*) another's (*para*) mind (*citta*).[1332]

One cannot directly prevent another from becoming passionate (*rajjati*), from hating (*dussati*), from erring (*muyhati*), from becoming defiled (*kilissati*), or prevent in him the contact (*phassa*), the feeling (*vedanā),* the mind (*citta*), the faith (*saddhā),* the wisdom <232> (*paññā),* etc., that have already been produced (*uppanna*) in him from ceasing (*nirujjhati*). Similarly, one cannot make another understand completely (*parijānāti*) suffering (*dukkha*), abandon (*pajahati*) its origin (*samudaya*), realize (*sacchikaroti*) its cessation (*nirodha*) and cultivate (*bhāveti*) the Path (*magga*). Finally, one cannot act (*kāraka*) in the place of another (*aññа*) nor experience (*karoti*) the pleasure or pain (*sukhadukkha*) created by another (*parahata*), nor make another to feel the pleasure and pain created by ourselves.

155. One (*para*) cannot support (*paggaṇhāti*) another's (*para*) mind (*citta*).[1333]

Same proof as before.

156. One (*para*) cannot bequeath (*anuppadeti*) one's happiness (*sukha*) to another (*para*).[1334]

157. Having completely understood (*adhiggayha*), one does not take notice (*manasi karoti*).[1335]

One does not understand (*pajānāti*) a mind (*citta*) by means of itself.

158. Form (*rūpa*) is not cause (*hetu*).[1336]

[1329] Ibid., XV, 9.
[1330] Ibid., XV, 10.
[1331] Ibid., XV, 11.
[1332] Ibid., XVI, 1.
[1333] Ibid., XVI, 2.
[1334] Ibid., XVI, 3.
[1335] Ibid., XVI, 4.
[1336] Ibid., XVI, 5.

Form is neither a root of the good (*kusalamūla*) nor a root of the bad (*akusalamūla*). Furthermore, it is without object (*anārammaṇa*) and produces neither a call for attention *(āvajjanā)* nor resolution (*paṇidhi*), etc.

159. Form (*rūpa*) is without cause (*ahetuka*).[1337]

Form is not caused by greed (*lobha*) or hatred (*dosa*) or delusion (*moha*) or by their absence. Furthermore, it is without object (*anārammaṇa*) and produces neither apprehension nor resolution (*paṇidhi*), etc.).

160. Form (*rupa*) is indeterminate (*abyākata*).[1338]

Same proof as for thesis 158.

161. Form is not maturation (*vipāka*).[1339]

Same proof as for thesis 159.

162. In the Arahant there is no accumulationm of merit (*puññūpacaya*).[1340]

If the Arahant increased his merit, he should also increase his demerit (*apuñña*), which is impossible. Moreover, if the Arahant accumulates merit, he carries out (*karoti*) an action (*kamma*) that involves (*saṃvattaniya*) a destiny (*gati*), an existence (*bhava*), supremacy (*issariya*), sovereignty (*adhipacca*), a great enjoyment (*mahābhoga*), a great retinue (*mahāparivāra*), fortune among the gods (*devasobhaya*), fortune among humans (*manussobhagya*), which is impossible since the Arahant must be reborn no more.

163. For the Arahant there may be premature death (*akālamaccu*).[1341]

The Arahant may be killed (*ghātaha*), deprived of his life (*jīvitāvoropita*) by a murderer. His body is not protected from the destructive effects of poison (*visa*), the sword (*sattha*) or fire (*aggi*).

164. All of this (*sabbamidaṃ)* does not come from action (*kammato*).[1342]

Action does not come from action. Everything does not have as cause that which was done <233> earlier (*pubbekatahetu*). Everything does not come from the maturation of action (*kammavipākato*). Thus, the offences and crimes or the virtuous actions such as giving alms do not come from the maturation of action. Besides, being fruit (*phala*), the maturation of action has no fruit (*aphala*), whereas crimes, offences and virtuous actions have fruits (*saphala*).

165. Even that which is tied to the faculties (*indriyabaddhañña*) is not necessarily suffering (*dukkha*).[1343]

Only that which is not tied to the faculties *(anindriyabaddha*) is impermanent (*anicca*), composite (*saṇkhata*), subject to the law of destruction (*khayadhamma*), to the law of cessation (*nirodhadhamma*), to the law of transformation (*vipariṇāmadhamma*). But that which is impermanent is suffering, the Buddha taught. Therefore, that which is not tied to the faculties is suffering, but that which is tied to the faculties is not necessarily suffering.

[1337] Ibid., XVI, 6.
[1338] Ibid., XVI, 7.
[1339] Ibid., XVI, 8.
[1340] Ibid., XVII, 1.
[1341] Ibid., XVII, 2.
[1342] Ibid., XVII, 3.
[1343] Ibid., XVII, 4.

166. With the exception *(ṭhapetvā)* of the noble Path (*ariyamagga*), the remaining (*avasesa*) formations (*saṇkhāra*) are not necessarily suffering (*dukkha*).[1344]

If this were not so, the origin of suffering (*dukkhasamudaya*) would be suffering and thus there would be only three noble Truths (*ariyasacca*), whereas the Buddha taught four. Furthermore, if the formations were suffering because they are impermanent (*anicca*), the noble Path, being impermanent, would also be suffering.

167. The Community (*saṇgha*) receives (*paṭiggaṇhāti*) donations (*dakkhiṇa*).[1345]

The Community is worthy of offerings *(āhuneyya*), worthy of invitations to a meal (*pāhuneyya*), worthy of donations (*dakkhiṇeyya*), worthy of respect (*añjalīkaraṇīya*), and it is the supreme (*anuttara*) field of merit (*puññakkhetta*) in the world (*loka*). Moreover, it consists of four pairs of men (*purisayuga*), of eight human individuals (*purisapuggala*) and it is recommended to make gifts to it (*dānaṃ denti*).

168. The Community (*saṇgha*) purifies (*visodheti*) gifts (*dakkhiṇa*).[1346]

Same proof as before.

169. The Community (*saṇgha*) eats (*bhuñjati*), drinks (*pivati*), chews (*khādati*) and tastes (*sāyati*).[1347]

Some people (*keci*) prepare (*karenti*) food (*bhatta*) and drinks made of rice (*yāgupāna*) especially (*uddesa*) for the Community. Besides, the Buddha taught the four kinds of food (*bhojana*) and the eight kinds of drink (*pāna*) of the Community.

170. That which is given (*dinna*) to the Community (*saṇgha*) produces a great fruit (*mahapphala*).[1348]

Same proof as thesis 167.

171. That which is given (*dinna*) to the Buddha produces a great fruit (*mahapphala*).[1349] <234>

The Buddha is the peak (*agga*) of bipeds (*dipada*), the best (*seṭṭha*) of bipeds, the deliverance (*pamokkha*) of bipeds, the greatest (*uttama*) of bipeds, the most noble (*pavara*) of bipeds, peerless (*asama*), without equal (*asamasama*), etc. Consequently, the gift made to the Buddha produces a great fruit.

172. The gift (*dāna*) is purified (*visujjhati*) by the recipient (*paṭiggāhaka*) and not by the donor (*dāyaka*).[1350]

Some (*keci*) recipients, like the Community, are worthy of offerings *(āhuneyya*), worthy of invitations to a meal (*pāhuneyya*), worthy of donations (*dakkhiṇeyya*), worthy of respect (*añjalīkaraṇīya*) and constitute the supreme (*anuttara*) field of merit (*puññakkhetta*) in the world (*loka*). Four pairs of men (*purisayuga*) and eight human individuals (*purisapuggala*) are worthy of donations. Some, having made a gift (*dānaṃ*

[1344] Ibid., XVII, 5.
[1345] Ibid., XVII, 6.
[1346] Ibid., XVII, 7.
[1347] Ibid., XVII, 8.
[1348] Ibid., XVII, 9.
[1349] Ibid., XVII, 10.
[1350] Ibid., XVII, 11.

datvā) to a Sotāpanna or a Sakadāgāmī or an Anāgāmī or an Arahant are rewarded *(ārādhenti*) because of their donation (*dakkhiṇā*).

173. The Buddha Bhagavant lived (*aṭṭhāsi*) in the world of humans (*manusaloka*).[1351]

There are places of residence of the Buddha (*buddhavuttha*), shrines (*cetiya*), parks *(ārāma*), monasteries (*vihāra*), villages (*gāma*), markets (*nigama*), towns (*nagara*), kingdoms (*raṭṭha*), lands (*janapada*) where he lived. He was born (*jāta*) at Lumbinī, he became fully enlightened (*abhisambuddha*) at the foot (*mūla*) [of the tree] of Enlighteement (*bodhi*), the wheel of the Dhamma (*dhammacakka*) was turned (*pavattita*) by the Bhagavant at Vārāṇasī, his vital element was given up (*ossaṭṭha*) at the shrine of Pāvāla, he was completely extinguished (*parinibbuta*) at Kusinārā. In the Suttas, the Buddha himself said that he lived in such and such a place.

174. The Dhamma was taught (*desita*) by the Buddha Bhagavant.[1352]

The Dhamma could have been taught only by a conqueror (*jina*), a master (*satthā)* completely and perfectly enlightened (*sammāsambuddha*), omniscient (*sabbaññu*), all-seeing (*sabbadassāvī*) teacher of the Dhamma (*dhammasāmī*), refuge of the Dhamma (*dhammapaṭisaraṇa*). It could not have been taiught either by a magical creation *(abhinimmita*) or by Ānanda. Moreover, in the Suttas, the Buddha says that he taught the Dhamma.

175. The Buddha Bhagavant has compassion (*karuṇā*).[1353]

He has compassion just as he has loving-kindness (*mettā),* joy (*muditā)* and equanimity (*upekkhā)*. Moreover, he feels loving-kindness for the world (*lokahita*), sympathy for the world (*lokānukampaka*), interest for the world (*lokatthacara*) and has attained (*samāpajji*) the absorption of great compassion (*mahākaruṇāsamāpatti*).

176. The excrement and urine (*uccārapassāva*) of the Buddha Bhagavant is not excessively (*ativiya*) surpassed (*adhiggaṇhāti*) by other (*añña*) perfumes (*gandhajāta*).[1354]

The Buddha does not eat perfumes (*gandhabhoji*) but he eats (*bhuñjati*) boiled rice and slightly sour gruel (*odanakummāsa*).

177. The four Fruits of the religious life (*sāmaññaphala*) are not realized (*sacchikaroti*) by means of one single (*eka*) noble Path (*ariyamagga*).[1355] <235>

Obviously they cannot be realized by any one of the three lower Paths, nor can they be realized by the Path of the Arahant, for the latter does not, like the other three, consist of abandoning the first fetters.

178. One cannot pass directly from one meditation level (*jhāna*) to another.[1356]

Thus, one cannot pass directly from the first meditation to the third or from the second to the fourth, neither does one pass directly from one to the following one, for they do not produce either apprehension

[1351] Ibid., XVIII, 1.
[1352] Ibid., XVIII, 2.
[1353] Ibid., XVIII, 3.
[1354] Ibid., XVIII, 4.
[1355] Ibid., XVIII, 5.
[1356] Ibid., XVIII, 6.

(āvajjanā) or reslution (*paṇidhi*), etc., are not produced under the same conditions and are not the same members (*aṇga*).

179. There are no intermediate stages between the meditations (*jhānanāntarika*).[1357]

There is no intermediate stage between the second meditation level and the third, or between the third and the fourth. Between the first and the second, there is the meditation (*samādhi*) without examination (*avitakka*) but with reflection (*vicāramatta*) only, but which should not be counted as an intermediate stage of meditation.

180. He who is in absorption (*samāpanna*) does not hear (*suṇāti*) sound (*sadda*).[1358]

He who is in absorption is completely insensible. His five sense organs and five sense consciousnesses are not functioning. Only his mental consciousness (*manoviññāṇa*) is still functioning.

181. Form (*rūpa*) is not seen (*passati*) by the eye (*cakkhu*).[1359]

Actually, the eye is just material form, and form is neither seen nor recognized (*paṭivijānāti*) by form, which is insensible. It is the mental consciousness (*manoviññāna*) which, by centralizing the sensations, sees, hears, feels and tastes.

182. Afflictions (*kilesa*), past (*atīta*), future (*anāgata*) and present (*paccuppanna*), are not abandoned.[1360]

Since past affictions no longer exist and future afflictions do not yet exist, they cannot be abandoned. As for present afflictions, they cannot be abandoned either, for the the passionate person (*ratta*) does not abandon passions (*rāga*), the hateful person (*duṭṭha*) does not abandon hate (*dosa*), the deluded person (*mūḷha*) does not abandon delusion (*moha*), the defiled person does not abandon the defilements; and also, passion is not abandoned by passion, hatred is not abandoned by htred, delusion is not abandoned by delusion and the defilements are not abandoned by the defilements.

183. Emptiness (*suññatā)* is not included in the aggregate of the mental formations (*saṇkhārakkhandhapariyāpanna*).[1361]

Actually, the aggregate of the mental formations is impermanent (*anicca*), composite (*saṇkhata*), subject to the law of interdependent production (*paṭiccasammupanna*), to the law of destruction (*khayadhamma*), to the law of decline (*vayadhamma*), to the law of detachment (*virāgadhamma*), to the law of cessation (*nirodhadhamma*), to the law of transformation (*vipariṇāmadhamma*). Furthermore, emptiness also characterizes the five aggregates. <236>

184. The Fruits of the religious life (*sāmañña phala*) are not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1362]

185. The attainments (*patti*) are not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1363]

186. Suchness (*tathatā)* is not non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1364]

[1357] Ibid., XVIII, 7.
[1358] Ibid., XVIII, 8
[1359] Ibid., XVIII, 9.
[1360] Ibid., XIX, 1.
[1361] Ibid., XIX, 2.
[1362] Ibid., XIX, 3. See line of argument of theses 21 and 54.
[1363] Ibid., XIX, 4. See line of argument of theses 21 and 54.

187. The extinction element (*nibbānadhātu*) is indeterminate (*abyākata*).[1365]

It does not produce a call for attention *(āvajjanā*) or resolution (*paṇidhi*), etc., and it is without object (*anārammaṇa*).

188. There is no assurance of final attainment of awakening (*accanataniyāmatā)* for the worldly person (*puthujjana*).[1366]

The worldly person can produce (*uppajjeyya*) doubt (*vicikicchā),* therefore he is not esatblished in the good Path. He cannot abandon either doubt or conceptual views (*diṭṭhi*) since he does not follow any of the four good Paths necessary for this abandonment.

189. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*saddhā),* energy (*viriya*), mindfulness (*sati*), meditation (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññā)* are not exclusively supramundane (*lokuttara*).[1367]

The Blessed One said: O monks, in scanning (*volokenta*) the world (*loka*) with the Buddha eye (*buddhacakkhu*), I have truly seen (*addasaṃ ahaṃ)* beings (*satta*) having little dust (*apparajakkha*) or having a lot of dust (*mahārajakkha*), having sharp faculties (*tikkhindriya)* or having dull faculties (*mudrindriya*), having good dispositions (*svākāra*) or having bad dispositions (*dvākāra*), easy to teach (*suviññāpaya*) or difficult to teach (*duviññāpaya*), few among them (*appekacce*) seeing any danger of faults in the next world (*paralokavajjabhayadassāvi*)."

190. He who has deprived (*voropetvā)* his mother (*mātā)* of her life (*jīvitā)* unintentionally (*asañicicca*) has not committed an unpardonable *(ānantarika*) crime. In general, the five crimes are unpardonable only when they have been committed intentionally.[1368]

A crime or misadeed exists only if it has been committed intentionally.

191. The worldly person (*puthjjana*) can have knowledge (*ñāṇa*).[1369]

The worldly person can have wisdom (*paññā),* sapience (*pajānanā),* searching (*vicaya*), investigation (*pavicaya*), inquiry into the Dhamma (*dhammavicaya*), characterization (*sallakkhaṇā),* analysis (*upalakkhaṇā),* differentiation (*paccupalakkhaṇā),* he can attain (*samāpajjeyya*) the four meditations (*jhāna*) and the four formless absorptions *(ārūpasamāpatti*), he can give alms (*dānām dadeyya*), consequently he can have some knowledges.

192. There are hell guardians (*nirayapāla*) in the hells (*niraya*).[1370]

In the hells as among humans (*manussa*), there are causes of actions (*kammakāraṇa*) and as a result, there are agents (*kāraṇika*). Besides, the Buddha taught about their various rôles.

193. There are no animals (*tiracchānagata*) among the Gods (*deva*).[1371] <237>

The god realm (*devalok*a) is not an animal destiny (*tiracchānayoni*). There are no insects (*kīta*) there or locusts (*paṭaṇga*) or mosquitoes (*makasa*) or flies (*makkhikā)* or snakes (*ahi*) or scorpions (*vicchika*) or

---

[1364] Ibid., XIX, 5. See line of argument of theses 21 and 54.
[1365] Ibid., XIX, 6.
[1366] Ibid., XIX, 7.
[1367] Ibid., XIX, 8.
[1368] Ibid., XX, 1.
[1369] Ibid., XX, 2.
[1370] Ibid., XX, 3.
[1371] Ibid., XX, 4.

centipedes (*satapadī*) or earthworms (*gaṇdupāda*). Neither are there elephant-herders (*hattbandha*) or horse-stable men (*assabandha*).

194. The Path (*magga*) does not have five members (*pañcaṇgika*).[1372]

The Buddha taught that the Path has eight members (*aṭṭhaṇgika*) and not five, for right speech (*sammāvācā),* right conduct (*sammākammanta*) and right livelihood (*sammājīva)* are members of the Path (*maggaṇga*) to the same degree as the other five.

195. Supramundane (*lokuttara*) knowledge (*ñāṇa*) does not have twelve objects (*dvādasavatthuka*).[1373]

If it were otherwise, there would be twelve supramundane knowledges, twelve Sotāpatti paths (*magga*), twelve Sakadāgāmī paths, twelve Anāgāmī paths, twelve Arahant paths, and twelve corresponding fruits (*phala*).

196. The doctrine (*sāsana*) was not reformed (*nava kata*) during the Councils.[1374]

197. The worldly person (*putujjana*) can be separated from the things (*dhamma*) of the three worlds (*tedhātuka*).[1375]

At the moment (*khaṇa*) when the worldly person gives a monastic robe (*cīvara*), etc., having attained (*upasampajja*) one of the four meditations (*jhāna*) or one of the four formless absorptions *(ārūppasamāpatti*), he is abiding in these and consequently is separated from things of the three worlds.

198. There is no fetter (*saññojana*) that is not abandoned (*appahāya*) by the one who has attained Sainthood.[1376]

The Arahant is defined as having abandoned all the fetters, passion (*rāga*), hatred (*dosa*), delusion (*moha*), pride (*māna*), hypocrisy (*makkha*), resentment (*paḷāsa*), confusion (*upāyāsa*), the afflictions (*kilesa*).

199. There is no supernatural intentional power (*adhippāyayiddhi*) among the Listeners or among the Buddhas.[1377]

Neither the Buddhas nor the Listeners can make trees (*rukkha*) have permanent leaves (*niccapañña*) or permanent flowers (*niccapuppha*) or permanent fruits (*niccaphalika*), or make the full moon (*juḥā),* peace (*khema*), abundant alms (*subhikkha*), abundant rains (*suvuṭṭhikā)* be permanent (*nicca*). Neither can they make what has been produced (*uppanna*) not to cease (*nirujjhati*), or the five aggregates, once they have been produced, not to cease and to be permanent. They cannot make beings (*satta*), subject to the law of birth (*jātidhamma*), not to be born (*jāyanti*), or that beings subject to the law of old age (*jarādhamma*) not to grow old (*jīyanti*), or that beings subject to the law of disease (*bhyādhidhamma*) not to get sick (*bhādhiyanti*), or that beings subject to the law of death (*maraṇadhamma*) not to die (*miyyanti*).

200. There are many (*bahu*) differences in superiority (*atirekata*) among the Buddhas.[1378] <238>

[1372] Ibid., XX, 5.
[1373] Ibid., XX, 6.
[1374] Ibid., XXI, 1.
[1375] Ibid., XXI, 2.
[1376] Ibid., XXI, 3.
[1377] Ibid., XXI, 4.
[1378] Ibid., XXI, 5.

201. The Buddhas do not abide (*tiṭṭhanti*) in all (*sabba*) the directions (*disa*).[1379]

If the Buddhas abided in all the directions, what are the names (*nāma*), lineages (*jacca*), clans (*gotta*) of each direction, the names of their father and mother (*mātāpitā),* of their pairs of closest disciples (*sāvakayuga*), of their attendant (*upaṭṭhāka*), what are their monastic robe (*cīvara*), their alms bowl (*patta*) like, in what villages (*gāma*), market places (*nigama*), towns (*nagara*), kingdoms (*raṭṭha*), lands (*janapada*) do they reside? The opponent is indeed obliged to recognize that he does not know.

202. All (*sabba*) things (*dhamma*) are not determined (*niyata*).[1380]

All things are not established as to falseness (*micchatta*) or correctness (*sammatta*), and there is a group *(rāsi*) of things that is not fixed (*aniyata*), for the Buddha taught these three groups.

203. All (*sabba*) actions (*kamma*) are not fixed (*niyata*).[1381]

Same proof as above.

204. There is no fetter (*saññojana*) that is not abandoned in complete extinction (*parinibbāna*).[1382]

Same proof as thesis 198.

205. The Arahant is not completely extinguished (*parinibbayati*) by having a good (*kusala*) mind (*citta*).[1383]

The Arahant cannot accomplish an action (*kamma*) involving merit (*puñña*), implying a new destiny (*gatisaṃvattaniya*), a new existence (*bhava*), lordship (*issariya*), sovereignty (*adhipacca*), great enjoyment (*mahābhoga*), etc., and at the same time, become completely extinguished. The Arahant neither grows *(ācināti*) nor diminishes (*apacināti*), for he has already diminished as far as abandoning his entire stock of merits. He does not let go (*pajahati*) nor does he take up (*upādiyati*), having abandoned everything.

206. The Arahant does not become completely extinguished (*parinibbāyati*) by remaining *(ṭhita*) immobile *(āneñja*).[1384]

The Arahant becomes completely extinguished by remaining in natural mind (*pakaticitta*), in the mind of retribution (*vipākacitta*) which is indeterminate (*abyākata*).

207. There is no clear understanding (*dhammābhisamaya*) of the Dhamma in the womb (*gabbhaseyyā).*[1385]

In the womb, there is no teaching of the Dhamma (*dhammadesanā)* or hearing of the Dhamma (*dhammassavana*) or discussion of the Dhamma (*dhammasākacchā)* or questions (*paripucchā)* or taking possession of discipline (*sīlasamādāna*) or guarding of the gates (*guttadvāratā)* of the senses *(indriya*) or moderation (*mattaññutā)* of enjoyment (*bhoja*) or constant practice of vigilance (*pubbarattāpararattaṃ jāgariyānuyoga*), therefore there cannot be clear comprehension of the Dhamma during embryonic life.

[1379] Ibid., XXI, 6.
[1380] Ibid., XXI, 7.
[1381] Ibid., XXI8.
[1382] Ibid., XXII, 1.
[1383] Ibid., XXII, 2.
[1384] Ibid., XXII, 3.
[1385] Ibid., XXII, 4.

208. There is neither acquisition of Sainthood (*arahattappatti*) in the womb (*gabbhaseyyā)* nor clear understanding of the Dhamma (*dhammābhisamaya*) for the one <239> who is dreaming (*supinagata*).[1386]

There is no clear understanding of the Dhamma or acquisition of Sainthood for the one who has fallen asleep (*sutta*), is lazy (*pamatta*), is forgetful (*muṭṭhassati*), is inattentive (*asampajāna*).

209. All (*sabba*) the minds (*citta*) of the person who is dreaming (*supinagata*) are not indeterminate (*abyākata*).[1387]

The person who is dreaming can commit crimes and misdeeds, kill, steal, lie, etc., or, on the other hand, he can accomplish virtuous actions which will bear fruits.

210. There exists a certain (*kāci*) conditioning of repetition *(āsevanapaccayatā*).[1388]

As the Buddha has taught, the fact of repeating and action increases its maturation.

211. Every (*sabba*) thing (*dhamma*) does not last for a single instantaneous mind (*ekacittakkhaṇika*).[1389]

The great earth (*mahāpaṭhavī*), the great ocean (*mahāsamudda*), the king of the mountains (*pabbatarājā)* Sineru, water *(āpo*), fire (*tejo*), wind (*vāyo*), plants (*tiṇa*), woods (*kaṭṭha*), trees (*vanappati*), do not last (*saṇṭhahanti*) for a single moment of mind. Moreover, if things had only instantaneous duration, it would be impossible to explain sense consciousness, for its various elements are not produced at the same time.

212. The *dhamma* of mating (*methuna*) must not be practiced (*paṭisevitabba*), even with a single intention (*ekādhippāya*).[1390]

Whatever the intention may be, the practice of sexual relations for the monk is a very serious wrongdoing which involves the immediate loss of the religious estate and expulsion from the Community. Theravādins fear that by tolerating it, a laxism going so far as the committing of crimes in the Community will become established.

213. Non-human beings (*amanussa*) do not practice (*paṭisevanti*) the *dhamma* of mating (*methuna*) under the pretense (*vaṇṇena*) of Sainthood (*arahanta*).[1391]

Sexual practices being considered a crime and wrongdoing, if non-human beings carry them out under the pretext of Sainthood, they would kill, steal, etc., under the same pretext.

214. The Bodhisatta does not pass (*gacchati*) into an unfortunate destiny (*vinipāta*) in order to realize his supreme desire (*issariyakāmakārikāhetu*).[1392]

The opposite thesis is not founded on any Sutta. Of his own will, the Bodhisatta cannot be reborn (*upapajjeyya*) in a hell (*niraya*) or among the animals (*tiracchānagata*). Moreover, the Bodhisatta possesses no supernatural power (*iddhipāda*) by means of which he could descend (*okkamati*) into a womb

[1386] Ibid., XXII, 5
[1387] Ibid., XXII, 6.
[1388] Ibid., XXII, 7.
[1389] Ibid., XXII, 8.
[1390] Ibid., XXIII, 1.
[1391] Ibid., XXIII, 2.
[1392] Ibid., XXIII, 3.

(*gabbhaseyyā)* that he chooses. The Bodhisatta does not perform (*akāsi*) any misdeed (*dukkarakārika*) by his own will in order to be reborn into the bad destinies that are their fruits. At least, there is no *Sutta* that attests to it. <240>

215. There are no non-passions (*narāga*) that resemble the passions (*rāgapaṭirūpaka*).[1393]

216. The five aggregates (*khandha*), the twelve spheres *(āyatana*), the eighteen elements (*dhātu*), the twenty-two faculties (*indriya*) are complete (*parinipphanna*), but suffering (*dukkha*) is not complete.[1394] The aggregates, spheres, elements and faculties are impermanent (*anicca*), composite (*saṇkhata*), subject to the law of dependent origination (*paṭiccasamupanna*), the law of destruction (*khayadamm*a), the law of decline (*vayadhamma*), the law of detachment (*virāgadhamma*), the law of cessation (*nirodhadhamma),* the law of transformation (*viparināmadhamma*). That which is impermanent is suffering, but the aggregates, spheres, elements and faculties are impermanent, therefore suffering is not complete (!).

217. In the absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*), there remains a subtle (*sūkṣma*) mental consciousness (*manovijñana*) the aspect *(ākāra*) of which is non-perceptible (*asaṃvidita*) and which acts as nutrient *(āhāra*).[1395]

218. At the moment of conception, death, etc., there is a certain mental consciousness whose activity of cognizing and object are imperceptible.[1396]

219. Consciousness is a member of existence (*bhavāṇgavijñana*).[1397]
This special consciousness, which is cause (*hetu*) of existence and unites the various successive existences, is a prefiguration of the storehouse consciousness *(ālayavijñana*) of the Mahāyāna.

220. In the breast there is the heart (*hṛdayavastu*), of materal substance (*rūpadravya*), which serves as sense organ (*indriya*) for the mental consciousness (*manovijñana*).[1398]

221. Faith (*śraddhā)* has desire (*abhirāma, chanda*) as nature.[1399]

222. There are no seeds (*bīja*) that are entities in themselves.[1400]
The previous moment, whether of matter (*rūpa*) or mind (*citta*), is, according to its type, the seed of the later moment, whether material or mental. The chain of cause (*hetu*) and effect (*phala*) is established in this way. <241>

[1393] Ibid., XXIII, 4.
[1394] Ibid., XXIII, 5.
[1395] L.V.P.: *Siddhi*, pp. 141, 202-203 and 207.
[1396] Ibid., p. 198.
[1397] Ibid., pp. 179 and 196.
[1398] Ibid., pp. 281, 179 and 221. L.V.P.: *Kośa*, I, p. 32, note.
[1399] Ibid., p. 322.
[1400] Ibid., pp. 187, 188.

CHAPTER XXX

The Abhayagirivāsins or Dhammarucikas

The Abhayagirivāsins form the first schismatic school of the Theravadins of Ceylon. Their main place of residence was the Abhayagirivihāra founded at Anuradhapura by Vaṭṭagāmani 217 years, 10 months and 10 days after the Mahāvihāra, thus, according to the traditions, 24 years before our era.[1401] This monastery, from its founding, sheltered the seeds of heresy. One monk, Mahātissa, had been expelled from the Community for having associated with lay people. His disciple, Bahalamassutissa, followed the movement and established a faction there. The monks of this monastery followed the movement thus initiated and soon constituted a sect distinct from that of the Mahāvihāravāsins. Soon after, the monks of Dakkhiṇavihāra, founded by Uttiya, the friend of king Vaṭṭagāmani, who at first were united with those of Abhayagirivihāra, separated from them and formed the independent school of the Dakkhiṇavihāravāsin, of whom nothing more is known. Disturbed by these schisms, king Vaṭṭagāmani gathered together a council in which the Canon of the Theravādins and the commentaries (*aṭṭhakathā)*, preserved orally up to then, were written down.[1402]

In the second quarter of the 4th century of our era, King Goṭhakābhaya banished sixty monks of the Abhayagirivihāra who had adopted the Vetullaka doctrine.[1403] This doctrine had penetrated into Ceylon for some time and king Vohārikatissa, in the last years of the 3rd century, had already attempted to destroy it.[1404]

About fifteen years later, a Chola monk named Saṃghamitta, accepted by the Vetullakas, circumvented the young king Mahāsena and obtained permission from him to destroy the Mahāvihāra the monks of which fled. The Abhayagirivihāra was embellished. But under strong pressure from the minister Maghavaṇābhaya, supporter of the Mahāvihāravāsins, king Mahāsena withdrew his support from Saṃghamitta and from the Abhayagirivihāra.[1405] Fa-hien, who visited Ceylon in 412-414, attests that at that time the importance of the Abhayagirivihāra completely eclipsed that of its rival. In the former, there were 5000 monks and in the latter, only 3000.[1406] At the beginning of the 6th century, king Dhātusena redecorated the Abhayagirivihāra but suppressed the Dhammarucika heresy, i.e., that of the Abhayagirivāsins, which

---

Chapter XXX
[1401] *Mahāvaṃsa*: transl. Geiger, p. 235; Filiozat: *L'Inde classique*, vol. I, p. 247, §468.
[1402] Mahāvaṃsa, pp. 236-237. Since the reign of Vaṭṭagāmani ended 12 years before our era [more or less], the chronology of this schism and council is thus well established.
[1403] Ibid., p. 264. See below, chap. XXXIV.
[1404] Ibid., pp. 258-259.
[1405] Ibid., pp. 267-269.
[1406] Legge: *A record of the buddhistic kingdoms*, pp. 102-111.

had been adopted by the monks of the Cetiyavihāra.[1407] One century later, king Silākala again had to suppress the heresy of the Vetullakas which had reappeared in the Abhayagirivihāra.[1408] Starting in the 11th century, the struggle between the various schools of the Thervādins <242> died out in face of the Tamil invasions. About 1160, king Parakkama-Bahu the 1st tried to bring about the complete union of the three schools within the Mahāvihāra.[1409] Since that time there is no trace of the Abhayagirivāsin sect.

On the doctrine of the Abhayagirivāsins we are very poorly informed. One Ceylonese work of the end of the 14th century, the *Nikāyasangrahawa*, says that it had been borrowed from the Vajjiputtakas,[1410] which is rather unlikely. The Ceylonese tradition often designates this doctrine under the name of Dhammarucika from the name of its founder according to the above work,[1411] but this word, 'one who takes pleasure in or who makes the Dharma shine', may be an epithet given to its partisans. Some indications of it are found in the vast Pāli and Ceylonese commentaries such as the *Paramatthamañjusā* by Dhammapāla. Unfortunately, the analysis of these works from this point of view has not yet been done.

No work of the Abhayagirivāsins has come down to us, at least under their name. However, the Chinese Canon contains the translation of a treatise entitled *Vimuktimārgasāstra* by Upatiṣya, a translation made at the beginnning of the 6th century by the Cambodian Saṃghabhara.[1412] Bapat, who has dedicated two detailed studies to this work, concludes that it belongs to the Abhayagirivāsin school.[1413] Bagchi claims that the *Vimuttimagga* by Upatissa represents the Abhayagirivāsin version and the *Visuddhimagga* by Buddhaghosa represents the Mahāvihāravāsin version of the same work.[1414] A study bearing particularly on the definitions of certain characteristic elements (*asaṃskṛta; samādhi; vitarka* and *vicāra; prajñā; rūpaskandha* and derivatives; *saṃskāraskandha*; various *āyatanas*; four *satyas*, etc.)[1415] leads me [Bareau] to the following results: this work knows only one *asaṃskṛta*, which is characteristic of the Ceylonese Theravādins; the definitions given for the other elements are the same as are found in the Pāli *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, in particular in the *Dhammasaṇgaṇi* and the *Vibhaṇga*, and completely different from those in the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* of the Sarvāstivādins, the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra* and the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*. It is, therefore, certain that this work belongs to a school of the Theravādins of Ceylon and is based on the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* that we are familiar with. The slight divergences encountered imply that it used a version slightly different from that handed down to us by the Mahāvihāravāsins. As this work is absolutely unknown by the lists of Ceylonese post-canonical works and, since Dhammapāla mentions it in

[1407] Kern: *Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*, vol. II, p. 418 (date corrected).
[1408] Ibid., p. 419. C. Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism*, vol. II, p. 33.
[1409] See preceding chapter.
[1410] C. Eliot: Op. cit., p. 19.
[1411] Ibid.
[1412] T.S. 1648.
[1413] P.V. Bapat: *Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga*, Indian Culture, I, Jan. 1935, pp. 158-9 and P.V. Bapat: *Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga*, Poona, 1937.
[1414] P.C. Bagchi: *On the original Buddhism, its Canon and language*, Sino-Indian Studies, II, 3-4, 1946-7, p. 113.
[1415] T.S. 1648, pp. 427ab; 416c;415b;444c;447c;448c-449a;452ab, etc. Also the list of dharmas given on pp. 447ab, 448b and 453ab is, from all evidence, an earlier stage of the two lists given by the *Dhammasaṇgaṇi* and the *Vibhaṇga*.

the *Paramatthamañjusā* as constituting a heresy,[1416] it is certain that it was not composed on the other hand by a monk of the Mahāvihāra. Thus it can belong only to the Abhaygirivāsins or the Jetavanīyas and most likely to the former rather than to the latter if their relative importance and the importance of the work, rightly compared to the well-known *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa, are considered.

If, as it does appear, the *Vimuttimagga* of Upatissa is the work of an Abhayagirivāsin, we may draw various conclusions from its examination. First of all, <243> the various schools of the Ceylonese Theravādins shared the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* or, at least, the greatest part of it, including the *Dhammasaṇgaṇi* and the *Vibhaṇga*. The Ceylonese tradition accuses the Abhayagirivāsins only of rejecting the *Parivāra* of the *Vinayapiṭaka*.[1417] Furthermore, at the time when they seceded, about 20 C.E., the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* was completed or almost completed, since at least seven works of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* were already at least partially in place and were able to serve as basic reference for the two schools. If, as tradition has it, the Abhayagirivāsins later incorporated a *Vetullapiṭaka* into the Canon,[1418] which may have included the Mahāyānasūtras, they had in common, nevertheless, with the Mahāvihāravāsins all or almost all of the doctrine included in the Pāli *Tipiṭaka* which the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, along with the *Dhammasaṇgaṇi*, the *Vibhaṇga* and certainly the *Puggalapaññatti* and the greater part of the *Kathāvatthu*, had rigorously determined.

Hiuan-tsang, who, about 640, traveled in the extreme south of India with the hope, disappointed, of visiting Ceylon, collected some information about this island where, the fact emerges, that although the monks of the Mahāvihāra were strictly Hīnayānist, those of the Abhayagirivihāra had adopted both the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna.[1419] This seems to be confirmed by what we know of the Vetullaka doctrine[1420]which is generally thought to have influenced the Abhayagirivāsins since the 3rd century of our era. But, as we have just seen - and this coincides well with what Hiuan-tsang says - this Mahāyānist doctrine could only have been superimposed among the Abhayagirivāsins on the Hīnayānist doctrine contained in the *Tipiṭaka* which remained at the basis of their Canon.

We may recall that Hiuan-tsang also met Sthaviras of the Mahāyāna who belonged, whether perhaps to the Abhayagirivāsins or at least to an apparently close sect, at Bodh-Gayā (1000 monks in one monastery), at Kaliṅa (500 monks in 10 monasteris), at Bhārukaccha (300 monks in 10 monasteries), and at Surāṣtra (about 3000 monks in 50 monasteries). Those at Bodh-Gayā were dwelling in a monastery built by an early king of Ceylon.[1421] <244>

[1416] "… *ekacce te Upatissatheraṃ sandhāya āha tena hi Vimuttimagga tathā vuttam*…" (Burmese ed., p. 113; Siamese ed., p. 179).
[1417] Kern: Op. cit., p. 368.
[1418] C. Eliot: Op. cit., p. 33.
[1419] Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels*, II, pp. 234-235.
[1420] See below, chapter XXXIV.
[1421] Watters: Op. cit., II, p. 136.

CHAPTER XXXI

The Jetavanīyas or Sāgalikas

The Jetavanīyas make up the second schismatic sect of the Ceylonese Theravādins. Their residence was at the Jetavanavihāra, founded by king Mahāsena in the middle of the 4th century of our era. After the death of Saṃghamitta who had urged him to destroy the Mahāvihāra, Mahāsena built the Jetavanavihāra at Anuruddhapura at the instigation of the monk Tissa, another adversary of the Mahāvihāra. Tissa was soon excommunicated on a complaint registered to the king[1422] by the Community, but the Jetanavihāra became the seat of a new school, that of the Sāgalikas, from the name of its founder Sāgala.

The Jetavanīyas do not seem to have played a large role in the history of Ceylonese Buddhism. Neither Fa-hien, who lived in Ceylon from 412 to 414, nor Hiuan-tsang who, although he was unable to visit the island as he had planned, in 640 collected much information on it, do not mention the Jetanavihāra or the school that had its center there.[1423]

The Ceylonese tradition mentions only one incident concerning them: in the 7th century under the reign of Aggabodhi the 1st, a quarrel erupted between the monks of the Jetavanavihāra and those of the Mahāvihāra.[1424] About 1160, king Parakkama bāhu the 1st tried to unite the two dissident schools, the Jetavanīya and the Mahāvihāra.[1425] Since that time, there has been no trace of he Jetavanīyas.

We know nothing of their doctrine. Perhaps the complete and minute exmination of the Pāli commentaries will fill this gap. Tradition states that the Jetavanīyas rejected both the *Vibhaṇga* and the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Theravādins[1426] and that, in the example of the Abhayagirivāsins, they added to the Canon a *Vetullakapiṭaka* which perhaps contained *Mahāyānasūtras*.[1427] They seem to have held a doctrine fairly close to that of the Abhayagirivāsins and like it, characterized by a Mahāyānist superstructure resting on the solid and vast Hinayānist infrastructure which constituted the Pāli *Tipiṭaka*, although divested of a few parts.

No work of Jetavanīyan origin has come fown to us and it is not very likely that Upatisya's *Vimuktimārgaśāstra*, of which we have the Chinese version, belonged to them. <245>

Chapter XXXI.
[1422] *Mahāvaṃsa*: transl. Geiger, pp. 269-270.
[1423] Legge: *A record of buddhistic kingdoms*, pp. 101-112; Watters: On *Yuan-chwang's travels*, II, pp. 234-236.
[1424] Kern: *Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*, II, p. 419.
[1425] Ibid., p. 421-422; C. Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism*, II, p. 33.
[1426] Kern: Op. cit., p. 409.
[1427] C. Eliot: Op. cit., p. 33.

CHAPTER XXXII

The Hetuvādins

We have very little information on the Hetuvādins or 'Causalists'. Bhavya (list 1) identifies them with the Sarvāstivādins and attributes to them as their fundamental thesis: "That which has been produced (*utpanna*), that which is produced (*utpadamāna*) and that which must be produced (*utpappavya*), all are provided with causes (*sahetuka*)." But this proposition, which took its origin in the very teaching of the Buddha on the theory of dependent origination *(pratīyasamutpāda*), was accepted by all the Buddhist sects. Buddhaghosa attributes to the Hetuvādins ten theses of the *Kathāvatthu*. He does not specify who these Hetuvādins were nor what their origin was, but he does distinguish them from the Sarvāstivādins to whom he attributes four different opinions. Moreover, two of the theses attributed by him to the Hetuvādins are opposite to those of the Sarvāstivādins.[1428] Since Buddhaghosa begins to encounter the Hetuvādin theses only starting at the XVth section of the *Kathāvatthu*, it seems likely that they appeared late. Here are their propostions:

1. The four impurities *(āsava*) are pure (*anāsava*).[1429]

There are only four impurities, no more. Therefore there is not a further one by which the first four could be made impure (*sāsava*). This is why the four impurities are pure.

2. The absorption of cessation (*saññāveditanoridhasamāpatti*) is supramundane (*lokuttara*).[1430]

The absorption of cessation not being mundane (*lokiya*), it is necessarily supramundane.

3. The absorption of cessation is mundane.[1431]

Not being supramundane, it is mundane. It is surprising that these two contradictory theses would be held by members of the same school.

4. The absorption of cessation is associated with (*upika*) the beings of non-perception (*asaññasatta*).[1432]

This seems to pertain to a rather confused commentary by the *Kathāvatthu* and by Buddhaghosa according to which, since perception has ceased in the absorption in question, the Gods without perception thus fulfill the condition necessary to practice it.

5. One (*para*) passes on (*anuppadeti*) one's happiness (*sukha*) to another (*para*).[1433]

The venerable Udāyī said: "In truth, the Blessed One is the destroyer <246> (*apahattā)* of many painful things (*dukkhadhamma*). In truth, the Blessed One is the one who brings many pleasant things

---

Chapter XXXII
[1428] *Kathāvatthu*, XIX, 8 and XX, 2.
[1429] *Kathāvatthu*, XV, 5.
[1430] Ibid., XV, 7.
[1431] Ibid., XV, 8.
[1432] Ibid., XV, 10
[1433] Ibid., XVI, 3.

(*sukhadhamma*). In truth, the Blessed One is the destroyer of many bad (*akusala*) things. In truth, the Blessed One is the one who brings many good (*kusala*) things." Therefore one can pass down happiness to another.

6. That which is tied (*baddha*) to the faculties (*indriya*) is suffering (*dukkha*).[1434]

That which is tied to the faculties is, like them, subject to the oppression (*paṭipīlana*) of increase (*udaya*) and decrease (*vaya*). Now that which is impermanent (*anicca*) is suffering (*dukkha*).

7. Except for the noble Path (*ariyamagga*), all the rest (*avasesa*) of the formations (*saṇkhāra*) are suffering (*dukkha*).[1435]

The noble Path is excepted because it is defined as the way (*paṭipadā)* that leads (*gāminī*) to cessation *(nirodha*) of suffering (*dukkha*).

8. The five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*saddhā*), energy (*viriya*), mindfulness (*sati*), contemplation (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*paññā)* are not mundane (*lokiya*) but only supramundane (*lokuttara*).[1436]

9. The worldly person (*puthijjana*) does not have knowledge (*ñāṇa*).[1437]

If the worldly person did have knowledge, he would thereby understand (*parijānati*) suffering (*dukkha*) completely, he would abandon (*pajahati*) the origin (*samudaya*), he would directly see (*sacchikaroti*) cessation (*nirodha*) and he would cultivate (*bhāveti*) the Path (*magga*), which is impossible.

10. Form (*rūpa*) is incomplete (*aparinipphanna*). The five aggregates (*khandha*), the twelve spheres *(āyatana*), the eighteen elements (*dhātu*) and the twenty-two faculties (*indriya*) are incomplete. Suffering (*dukkha*) is complete (*parinipphanna*).[1438]

The line of argument used is unclear. <247>

[1434] Ibid., XVII, 4.
[1435] Ibid., XVII, 5.
[1436] Ibid., XIX, 8.
[1437] Ibid., XX, 2.
[1438] Ibid., XXIII, 5.

CHAPTER XXXIII

The Uttarāpathakas

Buddhaghosa alone mentions them in his commentary on the *Kathāvatthu*, but he gives no indication either on the meaning of the name or on the place of the Uttarāpathakas in the table of relationship of the sects. After the Andhakas, it is to them that he attributes the greatest number of heresies, viz., 45, which proves the importance of this group.

The name Uttarāpatha means the way (*patha*) of the north (*uttara*), and, more precisely, the region west of Thaneswar, i.e., the whole Indus basin including the mountainous areas that border it to the north and the west.[1439] Buddhaghosa designates by the name Uttarāpathaka sects living in this vast area whom he could not specify further. These have in common only their geographical origin, hence the essentially eclectic nature of the collection of theses attributed to them. Actually, Buddhaghosa groups under their name propositions that have been held by sects as different as the Sarvāstivādins, the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptakas, the Sautrāntikas and the various schools of the Mahāsāṇghikas. Dutt's hypothesis, according to which the Uttarāpathakas appeared as an eclectic school having doctrines taken both from Mahāsāṇghika and Theravādin groups and which marked a real intermediate stage between the Hinayāna and the Mahāyāna,[1440] seems rather spurious and does not correspond to the actual state of affairs as it obviously presents itself.

The study of the collection of theses attributed by Buddhaghosa to the Uttarāpathakas can thus be of only purely geographical interest, but this is not to be sneezed at. Here are these propositions:

1. There is sainthood (*arahatta*) for the lay person (*gihī*).[1441]

One can become a Saint (*arahant*) while still remaining in the lay state (*gihīsaññojana*) and keeping the characteristics of the lay person (*gihībyañjane ṭhita*). This thesis represents one of the attempts at laicization of the Path of salvation which will end up in the Mahāyāna in the lay career of the bodhisattvas.

2. One can become a Saint (*arahant*) by being reborn (*saha upapattiyā*).[1442]

This is a thesis notably of the Sarvāstivādins. As Buddhaghosa explains it, this thesis, like the corresponding one of the Theravādins, arises from an interpretation of a Prakrit word. Some render it as *upapajjaparinibbāyin*, whence the above proposition, and others as *upahaccaparinibbāyin*, i.e., <238> 'completely extinguished by reducing [the life-span].' In whichever way it is interpreted, the word means the second type of Anāgāmin.

Chapter XXXIII
[1439] B.C. Law: *Geography of Early Buddhism*, pp. 48-49; Cunnungham: *Ancient Geography of India*, p. 13.
[1440] *Early Monastic Buddhism*, vol. II, p. 172.
[1441] *Kathāvatthu*, IV, 1. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1442] Ibid., IV, 2. Cf. L.V.P: *Kośa*, 38-40 and VI, 210-211.

3. All of the things (*dhamma*) possessed by the Arahant are pure (*anāsava*).[1443]

Since the Arahant is pure, all the things that concern him are pure.

4. The Arahant is endowed with four Fruits (*phala*).[1444]

The Arahant must have collected the three lower fruits successively, those of Sotāpanna or "Stream-Enterer [of the religious life]", Sakadāgāmin or "Once retruner [to existence]" and Anāgāmin or 'Non-returner [to existence]' and have kept them.

5. It is due to enllightenment (*bodhi*) that one is Buddha.[1445]

Enlightenment is defined as follows by Buddhaghosa: the knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the four Paths (*catumagga*) and omniscience (*sabbaññutañāṇa*). This thesis is another form of the one that radically distinguishes the career of the Buddhas, characterized by *bodhi*, from that of the Arahant.

6. The Bodhisatta is endowed with the marks (*lakkhaṇa*) of the Great Man (*mahāpurisa*).[1446]

This proposition is a corollary of the preceding thesis. The Bodhisatta, being endowed with the marks, is predestined to become Buddha or Cakravartin king, which distinguishes him from the simple Arahants. It follows that the career of the Bodhisattas and the Buddhas is different from that of the Arahants.

7. The knowledge (*ñāṇa*) of the disciple (*sekkha*) can be beyond training *(asekkha*).[1447]

This proposition rests on the canonical traditions according to which disciples such as Ananda gave evidence of knowledges that could be interpreted as beyond training.

8. For the person who is not yet assured (*aniyata*) on the path of salvation there can be knowledge (*ñāṇa*) only of the fact that he is directed towards assurance of the eventual attainment of enlightenment (*niyāmagamana*).[1448]

9. The absorption of cessation (*nirodhasamāpatti*) is non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1449]

The absorption of cessation is defined as the stopping (*appavatti*) of four aggregates (*khandha*). Not showing the characteristics (*lakkhaṇa*) of the composites (*saṇkhata*), we deduce that it is non-composite.

10. Space *(ākāsa*) is non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1450]

11. There are six destinies (*gati*).[1451]

In addition to the five destinies of hells (*niraya*), animals (*tiracchānayoni*), hungry ghosts (*pittivisaya*), humans (*manussa*) and gods (*deva*), the <249> Uttarāpathakas count those of the Titans (*asura*), whom the other sects place among the hungry ghosts.

12. Form (*rūpa*) has object (*sārammaṇa*).[1452]

[1443] Ibid., IV, 3.
[1444] Ibid., IV, 4.
[1445] Ibid., IV, 6.
[1446] Ibid., IV, 7.
[1447] Ibid., V, 2.
[1448] Ibid., V, 4.
[1449] Ibid., VI, 5.
[1450] Ibid., VI, 6.
[1451] Ibid., VIII, 1.
[1452] Ibid., IX, 3.

Form has object insofar as it has conditions (*sapaccaya*), but not otherwise. This object is not a perceptible object like that of visual or other consciousness.

13. The latent dispositions (*anusaya*) have no object (*anārammaṇa*).[1453]

The worldly person (*puthujjana*) who abides (*vattamāne*) with a good or indeterminate (*kusalābhyākata*) mind (*citta*) should be said (*vattabba*) to have latent dispositions (*sānusaya*). But these tendencies have no object.

14. The mind (*citta*) that has as object *(ārammaṇa*) the past (*atīta*) or the future (*anāgata*) is without object (*anārammaṇa*).[1454]

This is a consequence of the anti-Sarvāstivādin thesis. Since the past and the future do not exist, the mind that takes them as object is therefore without object.

15. Every mind (*sabbaṃ cittaṃ)* is subject to logic (*vitakkānupatita*).[1455]

Every mind is subject to logic both by the fact of its object *(ārammaṇato*) and by the fact of its connections (*saṃpayogato*) with other minds.

16. Meditation (*samādhi*) is the continuity of the mind (*cittasantati*).[1456]

The meditation that is able to last for a very long time without being interrupted is defined as the continuity of the mind during all this time.

17. The individual who must be reborn seven times at most (*sattakkhattuṃparama*) is assured (*niyata*) of the obligation of being reborn seven times at most.[1457]

The Sotāpanna or 'Stream-enterer' destined to be reborn seven times will attain nirvāṇa only when he is reborn seven times, not before, not after.

18. The bad destinies (*duggati*) are abandoned for the individual (*puggala*) in possession of the view (*diṭṭhisampanna*).[1458]

The individual in possession of the right view of the Dharma, i.e., the Sotāpanna or 'Stream-enterer' cannot fall back into the bad destinies.

19. He who remains for a cosmic eon (*kappaṭṭha*) in hell cannot have (*paṭilabheyya*) a good (*kusala*) mind (*citta*).[1459]

The murderer, condemned to remain for a cosmic eon in hell, is too hardened to have a good mind capable of making amends.

20. The individual (*puggala*) attached to an immediate destiny (*anantarāpayutta*) can enter into (*okkameyya*) the assurance of attaining eventual enlightenment (*sammattaniyāma*).[1460] <250>

21. He who is subject to the obstacles (*nivuta*) abandons the obstacles (*nīvaraṇa*).[1461]

[1453] Ibid., IX, 4. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1454] Ibid., IX, 6 and 7.
[1455] Ibid., IX, 8.
[1456] Ibid., XI, 6.
[1457] Ibid., XII, 5.
[1458] Ibid., XII, 8.
[1459] Ibid., XIII, 2.
[1460] Ibid., XIII, 3.
[1461] Ibid., XIII, 5.

He who is subject to the obstacles, covered (*ophuta*), enveloped (*pariyonaddha*) by the obstacles, abandons them thanks to the nature (*bhāva*) of purity (*suddhi*) which must be accomplished (*kiccā).*

22. There is passion (*rāga*) for the unpleasant (*asāta*).[1462]

This thesis rests on a Sutta: "He who feels (*vedeti*) a pleasant (*sukha*), painful (*dukkha*) or neither pleasant nor painful feeling (*vedanā)* is delighted (*abhinndati*) and approves of (*abhivadati*) this feeling."

23. The auditory consciousness (*sotaviññāṇa*) is produced (*uppajjati*) immediately after (*anantarā)* the visual consciousness (*cakkhuviññāṇa*). Or, in general: the five sense consciousnesses (*viññāṇa*) are produced mutually (*aññamaññassa*) immediately (*samanantarā)* one after another.[1463]

During a dance (*nacca*), singing (*gītā)* and music (*vādana*) show, one sees (*passati*) the forms (*rūpa*), one hears (*suṇāti*) the sounds (*sadda*), one smells (*ghāyhati*) the perfumes (*gandha*), one tastes (*sāyati*) the flavors (*rasa*), one touches (*pussati*) the touchables (*phoṭṭhabba*) at the same time, even thought the five sense consciousnesses are mutually produced continuously.

24. Noble form (*ariyarūpa*) is derived (*upādāyā)* from the great elements (*mahābhuta*).[1464]

Form derived from the great elements includes material things that are not the gross great elements, earth (*paṭhavi*), water *(āpo*), fire (*tejo*), wind (*vāyo*), but that are derived from them, like forms, sounds, smells, male and female behaviors, information conveyed by gestures or voice, etc. Some of these things may be noble, like right speech (*sammāvācā),* right conduct (*sammākammanta*), etc.

25. The speculative view (*diṭṭhigata*) is indeterminate (*abyākata*).[1465]

This thesis rests on a Sutta known also to the Theravādins who contest it. Actually, the Uttarāpathakas have wrongly interpreted the word *abyākata*. In this Sutta, when the Buddha declares that contradictory speculative theories are indeterminate, he obviously means that they are not certain, that they are false, illusory and that it is madness to belive in them (see the *Brahmajālasūtra*, recognized by all sects). The Theravādin criticism shows that the Uttarāpathakas gave to the word 'indeterminate' (*abhyākata*) the meaning that it usually has in scholastic Buddhism: neither good (*kusala*) nor bad (*akusala*).

26. Form (*rūpa*) is cause (*hetu*) and caused (*sahetuka*).[1466]

The four great elements (*mahābhūta*) are the causes of derived matter (*upādāyarūpa*). Matter, being conditioned (*sapaccaya*), it is therefore caused. The Uttarāpathakas take the word 'cause' (*hetu*) in its broad sense whereas the Theravādins understand by *hetu* only moral causes: envy (*lobha*), hatred (*dosa),* delusion (*moha*) and their opposites.

27. The gift (*dāna*) is purified (*visujjhati*) by the donor (*dāyaka*) and not by the recipient (*paṭigghāhaka*).[1467] <251>

If, on the other hand, the gift were purified due to the recipient, if it produced (*bhaveyya*) a great fruit (*mahapphala*) due to the recipient, the gift would be given by the donor but the reward (*vipāka*) would be

[1462] Ibid., XIII, 8.
[1463] Ibid., XIV, 3.
[1464] Ibid., XIV, 4.
[1465] Ibid., XIV, 8.
[1466] Ibid., XVI, 5 and 6.
[1467] Ibid., XVII, 11.

produced (*nibbattito*) by the recipient. In this case, the one (*aññ*a) being (*bhaveyya*) agent (*kāraka*) in respect to the other (*aññassa*), one would suffer pleasure or pain (*sukhadukkha*) created by another (*parakata*); the one would act (*kareyya*) and the other would feel (*paṭisaṃvedeyya*) the effect of the action. In order to escape this absurd and unjust consequence, it must be maintained that the gift is purified by the donor and not be the recipient.

28. The Buddha Bhagavant does not have compassion (*karuṇā)* or loving-kindness (*mettā)* or joy (*muditā)* or equanimity (*upekkhā).*[1468]

These are the four great sentiments specific to the Buddha that characterize his relationship with beings. The Uttarāpathakas liken these sentiments to passions (*rāga*) that would attach the Buddha to beings. Since the Buddha is rid of all passion, he is thus without compassion, loving-kindness, etc.

29. The excrement (*uccāra*) and urine (*passāva*) of the Buddha Bhagavant far (*ativiya*) surpass (*adhiggaṇhāti*) other (*aññ*a) perfumes (*gandhajāta*).[1469]

30. One realizes (*sacchikaroti*) the four (*catāri*) Fruits of the religious life (*sāmaññaphala*) by means of one single (*eka*) noble Path (*ariyamagga*).[1470]

This thesis is to be compared with thesis 4 above which it seems to contradict. Actually, the *Kathāvatthu* explains that only the Buddha realizes the four Fruits by means of a single path.

31. The past (*atīta*), future (*anāgata*) and present (*paccuppanna*) afflictions (*kilesa*) are abandoned (*jahati*).[1471]

This is a thesis held mainly by the Sarvāstivādins, among whom cessation due to discimination (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*) is aimed at past, future and present defilements.

32. The suchness (*tathatā)* of all things (*sabbadhamma*) is non-composite (*asaṇkhata*).[1472]

The suchness of everything is neither form (*rūpa*) nor feeling (*vedanā)* nor perception (*saññā)* nor mental formations (*saṇkhāra*) nor consciousness (*viññāṇa*). Therefore it is non-composite.

33. There is assurance of final attainment of enlightenment (*accantaniyāmatā)* for the worldly person (*puthujjana*).[1473]

34. He who has inadvertently (*asañcicca*) deprived his mother (*mātā)* of her life (*jīvitā)* is an irredeemable *(ānantarika*) murderer. In general, the five irredeemable crimes are the same whether they are committed intentionally or not.[1474]

35. The doctrine (*sāsana*) has been reformed (*nava kata*).[1475]

The doctrine of the Buddha has been reformed during the three Councils (*saṇgīti*). Thus it no longer represents the teaching of the Tathāgata but is a new teaching and consequently is apocryphal. <252>

[1468] Ibid., XVIII, 3.
[1469] Ibid., XVIII, 4.
[1470] Ibid., XVIII, 5.
[1471] Ibid.,XIX, 1. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1472] Ibid., XIX, 5. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1473] Ibid., XIX, 7. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1474] Ibid., XX, 1. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1475] Ibid., XXI, 1. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.

36. The worldly person (*puthujjana*) is not separated (*avivitta*) from the things (*dhamma*) of the triple world (*tedhātuka*).[1476]

Since the things of the triple world are not perfectly known (*apariññāta*) by the worldly person, he is not separated from them.

37. All (*sabba*) things (*dhamma*) are determined (*niyata*).[1477]

All things are determined as to their self nature (*sabhāva*) and never abandon (*vijahanti*) it. Thus, form (*rūpa*) is determined in the sense of form (*rūpaṭṭha*), in the self nature of form. Without this, form could become feeling (*vedanā),* perception (*saññā),* formation (*saṇkhāra*) or consciousness (*viññāna*). This proposition should be compared with thesis 32 which makes suchness (*tathatā)* a non-composite (*asaṇkhata*), i.e., an absolute.

38. All actions (*kamma*) are determined (*niyata*).[1478]

This proposition is similar to the preceding one of which it is the corollary. The maturation of actions is determined, just as the latter are determined by the circumstances of their perfomance (*diṭṭhadhammavedaniya*), their self nature being thus fixed. This thesis is to be compared with the one that makes dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*) a non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*), i.e., an absolute.

39. The Arahant who abides *(ṭhita*) in the Immovable *(āneñja*) can become completely extinguished (*parinibbāyati*).[1479]

This thesis rests on the Sutta: "Having come out (*vuṭṭhahitvā)* of the fourth meditation (*catutthajjhāna*), the Bhagavant becomes completely extinguished (*parinibbuta*) immediately afterwards (*samanantarā*)." But the stage called Immovable belongs to this fourth meditation. It follows that the Arahant can become extinguished like the Buddhas. This thesis is therefore to be compared to those according to which the career of the Sāvaka and that of the Arahant are identical.

40. There is clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the Dhamma in the womb (*gabbhaseyyā*).[1480]

The one who was a Stream-enterer (*sotāpanna*) in the course of a past lifetime (*atītabhava*) can attain clear understanding of the Dhamma when, in a new existence, he is in the embryonic state.

41. There is the attainment (*patti*) of sainthood (*arahatta*) in the womb (*gabbhaseyyā),* clear understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the Dhamma and attainment of sainthood for the one who is dreaming (*supinagata*).[1481]

This threefold thesis is of the same type as the preceding. Clear understanding of the Dhamma and attainment of sainthood can occur in states where consciousness is very much reduced.

42. All (*sabba*) the minds (*citta*) of the one who is dreaming (*supinagata*) are indeterminate (*abyākata*).[1482]

[1476] Ibid., XXI, 2. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1477] Ibid., XXI, 7. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1478] Ibid., XXI, 8. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1479] Ibid., XXII, 3. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1480] Ibid., XXII, 4. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1481] Ibid., XXII, 5. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1482] Ibid., XXII, 6. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.

This thesis is in contradiction to the preceding one and was not maintained by the same sects. It rests on the words of the Buddha in a Sutta: "The mind of the one who is dreaming is of no importance (*abhohārika*)." Whatever the actions he is dreaming about and of which he thinks he is the agent, they will have <253> no retribution, neither good (*kusala*) nor bad (*akusala*). The dream minds do not enagage any moral responsibility. This proposition is to be compared with the first thesis of Mahādeva.

43. There is no conditioning (*paccayatā*) by repetition *(āsevana*).[1483]

According to Buddhaghosa, the Uttarāpathakas based this thesis on the following argumentation: "Since all things (*dhamma*) are momentary (*khanika*) and nothing lasts *(ṭhitvā)* even for a moment (*muhuttam pi*)… there is no conditioning by repetition." But the *Kathāvatthu* clearly refers to another order of facts: the repetition *(āsevana*), practice (*bhāvanā*), frequent repetition (*bahulīkamma*) of misdeeds or virtuous acts and their respective retribnutions.

44. Non-human beings (*amanussa*) practice (*paṭisevanti*) the *dhamma* of mating (*methuna*) in the guise (*vaṇṇena*) of sainthood (*arahantānam*).[1484]

According to Buddhaghosa, these practices of non-human beings, gods or demons, are due to the example of lecherous monks (*pāpabhiklkhū disvā).* There may also be a trace here of the laicization of the career of the Saints which the Mahāyāna made it a point to honor, and even some tantric influence.

45. Form (*rūpa*) and the other aggregates (*khandha*), the spheres *(āyatana*), elements (*dhātu*) and faculties (*indriya*) are not complete (*aparinipphana*), but suffering (*dukkha*) is complete (*parinipphanna*).[1485]

The argumentation used here is not clear. <254>

[1483] Ibid., XXII, 7, Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1484] Ibid., XXIII, 2. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.
[1485] Ibid., XXIII, 5. Thesis of some Uttarāpathakas.

CHAPTER XXXIV

The Vetullakas

Buddhaghosa mentions them in his Commentary on the *Kathāvatthu* but does not define them in any way. He limits himself to giving them the epithet *mahāpuññavādasaṇkhāta*, 'considered as supporters of great merit'.[1486] The Ceylonese Chronicles mention them only in regard to the heretical tendencies of the monks of the Abhayagirivihāra in the reign of Sirināga I and his successors, i.e., at the end of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th century of our era.[1487] No explanation is given of the word. It may be compared with the Sanskrit word *vaipulya*, 'development', which characterizes the entire class of *Mahāyānasūtras*, being based on the fact that most of the theses that Buddhaghosa attributes to them seem to be Mahāyānist. Perhaps they should also be identified with the Vājirīyas who, along with the Andhakas and the Hemavatikas, belong to a late group of six sects recognized by the Ceylonese Chronicles and by Buddhaghosa, without their relationship with the old schools being defined in any way. Indeed, the Vājirīyas were the supporters of the diamond, *vajra*, and might be the same as those of the Vajrayāna or Diamond Vehicle from which came Buddhist Tantricism. It will be noticed that the last thesis of the Vetullakas is tinged with tantrism. It may be noted that the Indian apostles who, in China, propagated the Vajrayāna about 700 came from the southern or central India: Śubhakarasiṃha from Oḍra, Vajrabodhi from Malaya south of India, and Amoghavajra from Ceylon itself. The Ceylonese documents would thus allow us to discover the first manifestations of this movement in Ceylon from the end of the 3rd century or, in any case, before the 5th century.

The doctrine of the Vetullakas as Buddhaghosa presents it is very eclectic. Theses 4 and 5 represent the two contradictory positions of the Mahīśāsakas and the Dharmaguptakas on the merits of gifts to the Saṇgha and to the Buddha. Theses 6 and 7 are clearly Lokottaravādin. As for the tantric thesis, it is shared by the Vetullakas and the Andhakas. This leads us think that the Vetullaka doctrine had its roots in an Andhaka-Mahīśāsaka-Dharmaguptaka syncretism. It is undoubtedly them whom Hiuan-tsang designates under the name of Mahāyāna-Sthavira.

Here are their theses:

1. It must not be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that the Community (*saṇgha*) receives (*paṭiggaṇhāti*) a gift (*dakkhiṇā*).[1488]

Chapter XXXIV
[1486] Ibid., *Kathāvatthu*, XVII, 6,
[1487] *Mahāvaṃsa*, XXXVI, 46; *Dīpavaṃsa*, XXII, 45.
[1488] *Kathāvatthu*, XVII, 6.

The true (*paramattha*) Community is made up solely by the Fruits and the Path (*maggaphalāni*). There is no other Community than the Fruits and the <255> Path. But the Fruits and the Path do not receive any gift. Therefore it cannot be said that the Community receives a gift.

2. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that the Community (*saṇgha*) purifies (*vidodheti*) the gift (*dakkhiṇā*).[1489]

The Community is made up solely of the Path and the Fruits. But these are not able (*sakkonti*) to purify the gift. Therefore it must not be said that the Community purifies the gift.

3. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that the Community (*saṇgha*) eats (*bhuñjati*), drinks (*pivati*), chews (*khādati*) or tastes (*sāyati*).[1490]

The Community is made up solely of the Path and the Fruits. But these do not eat, drink, chew or taste. Therefore it cannot be said that the Community eats, drinks, chews, tastes. These three theses are based on a purely spiritual conception of the Community, the latter not being made up of the group of monks considered as people, body and spirit, but only of their shared spiritual properties, the Path and the Fruits, which effectively distinguish them from all other beings. The Community is analogous to what Christianity calls *corpus mysticum*. Traces of this tendency are found in the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*,[1491] but it is greatly expanded in the *Mahāyānasūtras* which make the spiritual Saṇgha a transcendent absolute. Here we are thus in the presence of a Mahāyānist or, at least, pre-Mahāyānist, doctrine.

4. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ*) that what is given (*dinna*) to the Community (*saṇgha*) produces a great fruit (*mahapphala*).[1492]

5. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that what is given (*dinna*) to the Buddha produces a great fruit (*mahapphala*).[1493]

In contrast to what went on for the Mahīśāsakas and the Dharmaguptakas who were split on this twofold problem, the Vetullakas adopted these two theses conjointly.

6. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that the Buddha Bhagavant dwells (*ahasi*) in the world of humans (*manussaloka*).[1494]

This is clearly a Lokottaravādin thesis. The Buddha does not live (*vasati*) in the human world. It was only a bodily image created by him (*nimittarūpamattaka*) that came *(āgacchati*) and appeared in the world, when it was reborn in the world of the Tusita Gods (*tusaitabhavana*).

7. It cannot be said (*na vattabbaṃ)* that the Dharma was expounded (*desita*) by the Buddha Bhagavat.[1495]

This again is clearly a Lokottaravādin thesis. Remaining *(ṭhita*) in the city of the Tusita Gods (*tusitapura*), the Bhagavant sent (*pesesi*) a magical creation (*abhinimmita*) for the purpose of expounding the Dhamma

[1489] Ibid., XVII, 7.
[1490] Ibid., XVII, 8.
[1491] T.S. 1646, pp. 245b-247c.
[1492] *Kathāvatthu*, XVII, 9.
[1493] Ibid., XVII, 10.
[1494] Ibid., XVIII, 1.
[1495] Ibid., XVIII, 2.

(*dhammadesanatthāya*). The Dhamma was expounded by the Venerable Ananda who had received (*sampaṭicchitvā)* its exposition (*dhammadesana*) through the intermediary of this magical creation. <256>

8.The *dhamma* of mating (*methuna*) should be practiced with only one intention (*ekādhippāyena*).[1496]

According to Buddhaghosa, 'with one single intention' should be understood to mean either compassion (*kāruñña*) or the vow (*paṇidhi*): "We will be (*bhavissāma*) together (*ekato*) in the cycle of rebirths (*saṃsāra*)", pronounced after having worshipped the Buddha (*buddhapūjā)* with a woman (*itthī*). <253>

[1496] Ibid., XXIII, 1.

APPENDICES

In the following pages, the reader will find a group of tables indicating the position taken by each of the sects in each of the controversies that arose within the Hīnayāna. These controversies are classified methodically so that the reading of these charts allows one to grasp schematically yet completely the speculative activity of the Hinayāna in any domain whatever. Therefore it constitutes a skeleton outline of the history of the thought of the Lesser Vehicle and it serves as a guiding principle for another work which will appear shortly and will deal with this subject.

The numbers are those of the theses. For example: Mahās 10 = thesis no. 10 of the Mahāsāṇghikas, see chapter I of part II. The names of the sects are abbreviated to save space. The forms used are sufficiently clear that there is no need for further explanation. In some cases, one may be surprised not to find the corresponding thesis under the indicated number. Actually, the thesis in question is a corollary of the thesis indicated or else it is supported by the commentary.

The question mark (?) indicates that the attribution is uncertain for various reasons (contradictory data, unclear attribution, a probable corollary of another thesis).

In regard to the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins, the numbers of the theses are not always indicated. These are theses not listed in the corresponding chapters but which are easily found in treatises of both sects. When the number is not given after the name of another sect, it is a matter of a thesis reported in the first part of the corresponding chapter, before the enumerated classification of the theses of this sect.

APPENDIX I

Theses, Agreements & Disagreements

Theses	Agree	Disagree
The Buddha		
Buddha is supramundane	Mahās 1; Vetull 6	
B. is perfectly pure	Mahās 2	
B. has no appropriations	Mahās 2	
The birth body of the B. is pure	Mahās. 2; Vibh 2	Sarv 92
The *vohāra* of the B. is supramundane	Andh 5	Ther 20
B. does not abide among humans	Vetull 6	Ther 173
B. did not teach the Dharma	Vetull 7	Ther 174
B. is always in meditation	Mahās 12; Vibh 12	Sarv
B. always has the two supreme *jñānas*	Mahās 15	
B. never sleeps or dreams	Mahās 10; Vibh 13	Sarv
B. does not say anything but one hears him	Mahās 12	
B. always turns the wheel of the Dharma	Mahās 3	Sarv 53
B. answers without needing to think about it	Mahās 11	
The speech of the B. manifest his essence	Mahās 5	
The words of the B. always agree with the meaning	Mahās 5	Sarv 55
The Sutras of the B. always are of clear meaning	Mahās 42	Sarv 56
B. exists substantially	Mahās 17	
Many B. exist everywhere simultaneously	Mahās 16	Ther 201
The body of the B. is infinite	Mahās 6	
The life of the B. is infinite	Mahās 8	
The power of the B. is infinite	Mahās 7	
The perfume of the B's excrement is sweet	Uttar 20; some Andh 56	Ther 176; other Andh
B. knows everything with one mind	Mahās 14	
B. understands everything instantaneously	Mahās 13	
With one sound, the B. teaches the entire Dharma	Mahās 4	Sarv 54
B. trains beings tirelessly	Mahās 9	
The strength of the B is noble	Andh 8	Ther 23
One becomes B. by Awakening	Uttar 5; *Śārīp* 3	Ther 39
All B. are alike	Andh 65	Ther 200
B. sees the past and the future	Sautr 21	Sarv
B. was converted by Kāśyapa	Andh 15	Ther 41
B. has compassion	Ther 175; Sarv 43; *Śārīp* 3	Uttar 28
The B.'s compassion is directed to beings		Sarv 43
B. and Śrāvaka have the same deliverance	Sarv 43; Mahīś 22	
"	Dharm 2	
B. and Śrāvaka have the same career	Mahīś 22	Dharm 2; Sarv 43

		Śārīp 3
B. is included in the Community	Mahīś 21; Sarv	Dharm 1; *Satyasid* 4
The gift to the B. produces great fruit	Ther 171; Dharm 1	Mahīś 21; Vetull 5
The Bodhisattva becomes B. in the antarabhava	Vatsīp 33	Ther 199

The Bodhisattva

Bodh. is conceived without love or hatred	Mahās 21; Vibh 36	Sarv 101
	Haim 4	
Bodh. has no *kalala, arbuda*, etc.	Mahās 18	
Bodh. is conceived as white elephant	Mahās 19	
Bodh. is born from his mother's right side	Mahās 20	
Bodh. has the signs of the Great Man	Uttar 6; *Śārīp* 3	Ther 40
Bodh. goes to the bad destinies	Mahās 22; Andh 71	Ther 214
	Cet 1; Sarv; Pūr 1; Apar 1	
Bodh. is worldly	Sarv 45; Haim 1 ?	

The Arhant

The A. is not captivated by another	Mahās 30; Pūrv 3	Ther 11; Sarv
	Apar 3; Bahuś 2	Samm?; Vātsīp?
	Cet 3; Haim 5	Mahīś?
The A. has ignorance	Mahās 30; Pūrv 4	Ther 12; Sarv
	Bahuś 2; Cet 3	Samm?; Vātsīp?
	Haim 5; Apar 4	Mahīś?
The A. has doubts	Mahās 30; Pūrv 5	Ther 13; Sarv
	Bahuś 2; Cet 3	Samm?; Vātsīp?
	Haim 5; Apar 5	Mahīś?
The A. is informed by another	Mahās 30; Pūrv 6	Ther 14; Sarv
	Bahuś 2; Cet 3	Samm?; Vātsīp?
	Haim 5; Apar 6	Mahīś?
The A. can regress	Sarv 14; Vātsīp 13	Ther 2; Mahās 37
	Samm 2, 14	Mahīś 17; Vibh 18
	Bhadr; Pūrv 15	
The A. regresses due to his actions	Pūrv 15; Samm 14	Ther 84
The A. is subject to *pratītyasamutpāda*	Sarv 29	
The A. receives the retribution of his actions	Sarv 40	
There is increase of merit for the A.	Andh 55; Sarv 30; Mahīś9?	Ther 162; Mahīś 9?
The A. is completely *anāsrava*	Uttar 3; Dharm 4	Ther 36; Sarv 38
	Dārṣṭ 2?	
The A. has *naivaśaikṣanāśaikṣa*	Sarv 38	
The 4 Fruits are attained by one single Path	Some Andh 57; Uttar 30	Ther 177; otherAnd
The A. is provided with the 4 Fruits	Uttar 4	Ther 37
The candidate for A.-hood already has 3 Fruits	Some Andh 16	Ther 42; otherAndh
All A. have *anutpādajñāna*		Sarv 15

The *ārya* of the *bhavāgra* is A. without Path	Vibh 22	Sarv 133
The A.'s have the meditations	Sarv 39	
One can become A. without meditation	Sarv 21	
The A. becomes extinguished with a good mind	Andh 69	Ther 205
The A. becomes extinguished in the *aneñjy*a	Some Uttar 39	Ther 206; Sarv 42
"		Other Uttar
There is a *samaśīrṣin* A.	Vibh 22; Mahīś 12; Ther; *Śārīp* 57	Sarv 133
The A. may die prematurely	Ther 163; Sarv 126	Rājag 9; Siddh 7
"		Prajñ 6; Dārṣṭ 57
One becomes an A. by becoming reborn	Sarv; some Uttar 2	Ther 35;*Śārīp*; other Uttar
One becomes A in the embryonic state	Some Uttar 41	Ther 208; other Uttar
One becomes A. while sleeping	Some Uttar 41	Ther 208; other Uttar
The lay person can be A.	Uttar 1	Ther 34
The dead A. keeps a fetter	Mahās 75; some Andh68	Ther204;otherAndh68
The A has abandoned all the fetters	Ther 198; some Andh	Mahās75; other Andh68
Sainthood is the abandoning of all the fetters	Some Andh 17; *Śārīp* 27	Ther 43; other Andh
The A. has no more reasons to return to this world	Mahās 28	

Other Saints

The Saint is endowed with two virtues	Mahās 57	Ther 102; *Śārīp* 72
The material of the Saint is Path	Mahīś 26; Mahās 55	Ther 98
"	Samm 15; *Śārīp* 9	
The Srotāpanna can regress	Mahās 37; Mahīś 17	Ther 3; Sarv 14
The Srot. acquires the meditations	Mahās 50; Mahīś 31	Sarv 57
"	Vibh 37	
The Sakrdāgāmin acquires the meditations	Vibh 37	Sarv 57
The Srot. cognizes his nature	Mahās 29	
The Srot. may commit some wrongdoings	Mahās 41	
The *dṛṣṭivant* may be a criminal	Pūrv 21	Ther 122
The *dṛṣṭivant* abandons the *durgati*s	Uttar 18	Ther 123
The Srot. is reborn up to seven times	Uttar 18	Ther 120; Sarv
The candidate for Srot. abandons 2 obsessions	Andh 10; Samm 7	Ther 26; *Śārīp* 78
The candidate for Srot. has the five faculties	Ther 27; *Śārīp* 36	Andh 11
The *jñāna* of the *śaikṣa* is *aśaikṣa*	Uttar 7	Ther 45
Śaikṣa dharmas have *vipāka*	Kāś 4	
The Śrāvaka has knowledge of the Fruit	Andh 25	Ther 53
Buddha and Śrāvaka have the same deliverance	Sarv 43	
Buddha and Śrāvaka have the same Path	Mahīś 22	Dharm 2; Sarv 43

The Community

The Buddha is included in the Saṃgha	Mahīś 21; Sarv	Dharm 1; *Satyasid* 4
The gift to the Saṃgha produces a great fruit	Ther 170; Mahīś 21	Vetull 4; Dharm 1
"	Sarv; *Satyasid* 12	Vetull 4; Dharm 1
The Saṃgha is supraworldly	Bahuś 6; Vetull 1-3	Ther 167-169

The Saṃgha receives the gift	Ther 167	Vetull 1
The Saṃgha purifies the gift	Ther 168	Vetull 2
The Saṃgha enjoys the gift	Ther 169	Vetull 3

Lay People

The layman abandons *kāma* and *vyāpāda*	Sarv 16; Samm 5	Ther 6; Mahīś 5
"	Vātsīp 7	Dārṣṭ 22
Tīrthikas may have the five *abhijñās*	Sarv 17; Vatsīp 6	Mahīś 6; Dharm 3
"		Haim 2 ?
The layman has the knowledges	Ther 191; Sarv	Hetuv 9; Uttar 8
"	*Śārīp*	
The layman is included only in the three realms	Sarv 93; some Uttar 36	Ther197;other Uttar
The layman is included only in *kāmadhātu*	Vātsīp 20	Sarv 93; Ther 197
The nature of the layman is defiled	Vātsīp 20	Sarv 93
The layman can die with a good mind	Sarv 41	
The layman can become predestined to salvation	Uttar 33	Ther 188
The layman has noble things	Sautr 5	
The nature of the layman exists	Sarv 94	Dārṣṭ 20
The non-predestined can have the *jñānas*	Uttar 8	Ther 47

Criminals

The *ānantarya* enters the *niyāma*	Uttar 20	Ther 127
The predestined one enters the *niyāma*	Pūrv 22; Apar 8	Ther 128
The *kalpasthā* remains for a *kalpa*	Rājag 7	Ther 125
The *kalpasthā* has a good mind	Ther 126	Uttar 19
The one whom has hindrances abandons the hindrances	Uttar 21	Ther 129
The unintentional criminal undergoes his suffering	Some Uttar 34	Ther190;other Uttar

Gods and Demons

There is *virāga* in Uttarakuru		Sarv 23
There is *virāga* in the Asaṃjñin	Sarv 23; *Śārīp* 19	
There is *brahmacarya* among the Gods	Ther 4; Sarv 18	Samm 3; Mahiś 7
"	Dharm 5; *Śārīp* 19	Haim 3
There is *saṃjñā* in the Asaṃjñin	Andh 13; Sarv	Ther 32
There is *saṃjñānirodhasamāpatti* in the Asaṃjñin	Hetuv 4	Ther 152
There is actual *ātmagrāha* in the Asaṃjñin	Sautr 31	
The mental series alone is kept going in the *ārūpya* devas	Sautr 22	Sarv
There are animals among the Gods	Andh 63	Ther 193
There are hell guardians	Ther 192	Andh 62
Among non-humans *methuna dhamma* is a holy practice	Some Uttar 44	Ther213;other Uttar

Action

Pratityasamutpāda is *asaṃskṛta*	Mahās 43; Mahīś 19	Ther 55; Sarv 6, 28
"	Vibh 8; *Śārīp* 10	Vātsīp 38
"	Dharm 13; Pūrv 9	

Pratītyasamutpāda is reversible	Ther 145	Mahās 72
All action is provided with maturation	Mahās 67	Ther 117; *Śārīp* 33
There is no *avyākṛta*	Mahās 39	Ther; Sarv 37
"		*Śārīp 37*
All action is determined	Andh 67; some Uttar 38	Ther 203; other Uttar
Everything comes from action	Rājag 10; Siddh 8	Ther 164
All suffering comes from action	Prajñ 7	
The action and its maturation exist together	Late Mahās 5	
The person does not act	Prajñ 5	
There are 4 types of determination of action	Dārṣṭ 3	Sarv
The 3 *rāśi* exist everywhere	Dārṣṭ 44	Sarv 131
Action is different from accumulation	Andh 51; Samm 19	Ther 153
The unintentional criminal undergoes his suffering	Some Uttar 34	Ther 190; other Uttar
The fruition is realized only by accumulation	Prajñ 9	
All actions are reversible	Dārṣṭ 28	Sarv 119
Outside of *cetanā,* there are no actions	Dārṣṭ 54; Sautr 16	Sarv 117; Ther
"	Late Mahīś 4	*Śārīp* 42; Mahīś 27, 28
Physical actions are in harmony with the mind	Ther 95; late Mahīś 5 Pūrv 19	
Actions of speech are in harmony with the mind	Ther 94; late Mahīś 5 Pūrv 18	
Matter may be action	Mahīś 28; Samm 12	Ther 82
Discipline and non-discipline are action	Mahās 66; Sarv	Ther 116
"	*Śārīp* 73	
Ājīva differs from speech and action	Dārṣṭ 37	Sarv 120
Physical actions are visible	Andh ?	Ther 63; *Śārīp* 53

Actions

Cetanā alone is cause	Dārṣṭ 11; Ther	Sarv 75; Mahās 54
"		*Śārīp* 49
Citta and *caitta* alone are causes	Mahās 54	Ther; Sarv 75
"		*Śārīp* 49
Form can be cause	Uttar 26; *Śārīp* 29	Ther 158; Mahās 54
"	Sarv 75, 76; Mahīś 28 ?	Dārṣṭ 11
"	Samm 12 ?	
The five aggregates can be causes	Sarv 75; Śārīp 49	Mahās 54; Ther
"		Dārṣṭ 11
The *cittaviprayuktas* can be causes	Sarv 75, 76; Śārīp 49, 29	Mahās 54; Ther
"		Dārṣṭ 11
The *asaṃskṛtas* can be causes	Sarv	Sautr 20; Ther
"		*Śārīp* 62
Noble things are causes of maturation	Ther 72; Śārīp 35	Andh 32
The *śaikṣa* dharmas are causes of maturation	Kāś 4	
There are only past causes	Kaś 3	Sarv; Sautr 19
There are *sahabhūhetus*	Sarv	Sautr 19
Rūpa is *rūpasahabhūhetu*	Sarv	Dārṣṭ 1
Causality exists really	Sarv 71, 98	Dārṣṭ 9
The relationship of causality is determinate	Mahās 71	Ther 144
There is causality of repetition	Ther 219; other Uttar Some Uttar 43	

There are 4 kinds of causality	Late Mahās 2	
Goodness is cause of existence	Sarv 51	Mahīś 16
Citta and *caitta* are *samanantarapratyaya*	Sarv 119	Dārṣṭ 52

Fruition of Action

Feeling alone is fruit	Dārṣṭ 11	Sarv 75; Ther
"		Mahās 54, 69; *Śārīp* 49
Citta and *caitta* alone are fruits	Mahās NW[1497] (1) 54; Ther	Dārṣṭ 11; Sarv 75
"		*Śārīp* 49
Form can be maturation	Mahās C 69; Andh 52	Ther 161; Dārṣṭ 11
"	Sarv 75, 76; Samm 21	Mahās NW 54
"	*Śārīp* 20	
Form is provided with causes	Uttar 26; *Śārīp* 29	Ther 159; Dārṣṭ 11
"	Sarv 75, 76	Mahās NW 54
The 6 *āyatanas* are maturation	Mahās C 69; *Śārīp* 24	Ther 119; Dārṣṭ 11
"		Mahās NW 54
Sound is maturation	Mahās 68; *Śārīp* 23	Ther 118; Sarv 121
"	Vibh 1; Vātsīp 22	
The 5 skandhas can be fruits	Sarv 75; Śārīp 49	Ther; Dārṣṭ 11
"		Mahās NW 54
Vipāka is *vipākadharmadharma*	Andh 33	Ther 73
Earth is maturation	Andh 30; *Śārīp* 28	Ther 70
Old age and death are maturation	Andh 31	Ther 71; *Śārīp* 55
The latent dispositions have causes	Ther 108; Sarv	Mahās 63; Samm 17
Cessation has no cause	Dārṣṭ 12	Sarv 78
Generosity ripens in another lifetime	Rājag 6; Siddhi 6	Ther 69

Good, Bad and Indeterminate

The 5 consciousnesses are good or bad	Mahās ?	Ther 100; *Śārīp* 65
The 5 faculties are good only	*Śārīp* 69	Sarv 60; Ther
"	Mahās 38; Mahīś 13	
"	Vibh 3; Hetu 8	
Form can be good or bad	Mahīś 27, 28; Samm 13, 20	Ther 160; Mahās 54 ?
"	*Śārīp* 14	Dārṣṭ 11 ?
Nirvāṇadhātu is good	Andh 61; Sarv	Ther 187
"	*Śārīp* 12	
The defilements are bad only	Dārṣṭ 21	Sarv 85
The latent dispositions are indeterminate	Mahās 63; Samm 17	Ther 108; Sarv
In the higher realms, *śīlavrata* and *vicikitsā* are indeterminate	Vibh 30	Sarv 132
Dṛṣṭigata is indeterminate	Andh 50; Uttar 25	Ther 142
Dharmatṛṣnā is indeterminate	Pūrv 23	Ther 133
The minds of the dreamer are indeterminate	Some Uttar 42	Ther 209; other Uttar
There are indeterminates	Ther; Sarv 37	Mahās 39

[1497] Mahā NW = Mahāsāṃghika of the northwest of India.
Mahās C = Mahāsāṃghika of central India

“	*Śārīp* 33	
Good and bad roots are adjusted mutually	Mahās 70	Ther 135
The fetters exist	Dārṣṭ 25; Vātsīp 21	
“	Sarv 99	
The objects of the fetters exist	Sarv 99; Vātsīp 21	Dārṣṭ 25
That which has the immortal as goal is a fetter	Pūrv 16	Ther
Degeneration is production of defilements	Sarv	Vibh 18
The 4 *āsravas* are *anāsrava*	Hetu 1	Ther 148
The latent dispositions are different from the manifestly active defilements	Mahās 46; Mahīś 4 Vibh 38; Andh 47	Ther 139; Sarv 27
“		
The manifestly active defilements are dissociated from the mind	Andh 48	Mahās 46; Mahīś 4 Vibh 40; Ther 140; Sarv
“		
The latent dispositions are dissociated from the mind	Mahās 46; Mahīś 3 Vibh 39; *Śārīp* 5 Dārṣṭr 13; Vātsīp 37 Samm 17; Andh 39 Some Uttar 13	Ther 108; Sarv 26 Other Uttar
“		
“		
“		
The latent dispositions are mental and equipped with object	Ther 88; Sarv 26 Other Uttar	Mahās 45; Mahīś 3 Andh 39; Dārṣṭ 13 Some Uttar 13
“		
“		
The latent dispositions are indeterminate and without causes	Mahās 63; Samm 17	Ther 108; Sarv
The latent dispositions are always present	Late Mahīś 9	
The Path and the defilements arise together	Late Mahās 4	
Dṛṣṭi and *avidyā* are always *sarvatrāga*	Vibh 24	Sarv 73
Avidyā and *bhavatṛṣṇā* are *sarvatrāga*	Dārṣṭ 10	Sarv
Tṛṣṇā and *māna* are *sarvatrāga*	Vibh 24	Sarv 74
Abhidhyā, vyāpāda and *mithyādṛṣṭi* are mental actions	Dārṣṭ 4 Vibh 10	Sarv 118
“		
Aviññatti is *dussīlya*	Mahās 62	Ther 107
Only the defiled mind assures the continuity between the existences	Sarv 101	Vibh 36
Only *rāga* and *pratigha* assure the continuity between the existences	Dārṣṭ 26	Sarv 102
All the defilements assure the continuity between the existences	Sarv 102	Dārṣṭ 26
The 5 consciousnesses are *sarāga*	Mahās 24; Mahīś 10 Sarv 32; *Śārīp* 17	Vātsīp 5; Samm 24
“		
The 5 consciousnesses are *virāga*	Mahās 24; Mahīś 10	Vātsīp 5; Sarv 32 *Śārīp* 17; Samm 24
“		
The *sarāga* mind is delivered	Andh 9; Dārṣṭ 14 Vibh 23 ?	Ther 24; Sarv 80
“		
There is *rūparāga* only in *rūpadhātu*	Andh 49, 54; Samm 18	Ther 141
There is *arūparāga* only in *arūpadhātu*	Andh 49, 54; Samm 18	Ther 141

There is passion for what is unpleasant	Uttar 22	Ther 132
There are non-passions that resemble passions	Andh 72	Ther 215
The 5 *kāmagunas* are *kāmadhātu*	Pūrv 12	Ther 76
The 5 *āyatanas* are *kāma*	Pūrv 13	Ther 77
Vibhavatṛṣṇā is abandoned by seeing	Vibh 14	Sarv 79; Ther *Śārīp* 47
"		
There is *īrṣyā* and *matsara* in the *brahmaloka*	Vibh 35	Sarv 97
The Srotāpanna may commit wrongdoings	Mahās 41	
The *dṛṣṭivant* may commit wrongdoings	Pūrv 21	Ther 122
The Arhant has ignorance and doubts	Mahās 30; Pūrv 4, 5	Ther 12, 13; Sarv
"	Bahuś 2; Cet 3	
"	Haim 5; Apar 4, 5	
The *parinirvāyin* retains a space	Mahās 75; some Andh	Ther 204; other Andh
There are indeterminate defilements	Sarv 85	Dārṣṭ 21
All mistakes are abandoned only by seeing	Sarv 115	Vibh 15
The 8th individual abandons *dṛṣṭi* and *vicikitsā*	Andh 10; Samm 7	Ther 26; *Śārīp* 78
Śīlavrataparāmarśā and *vicikitsā* are indeterminate in the higher realms	Vibh 30	Sarv 132
Dharmatṛṣṇā is indeterminate	Pūrv 23	Ther 133
Dharmatṛṣṇā is the origin of suffering	Ther 134	Pūrv 24
Dṛṣṭigata is indeterminate	Andh 50; Uttar 25	Ther 142
Dṛṣṭigata is not included in the world	Pūrv 26	Ther 143
Satkāyadṛṣṭi is without object	Darṣṭ 6	Sarv 63
There are 4 mistakes	Sarv 115	Vibh 15
The defilements are abandoned one by one	Samm 4	Ther 5

The Path and Deliverance

Buddha and Śrāvaka have the same Path	Mahīś 22	Dharm 2; Sarv 43, *Śārīp* 3
Being endowed with the 5 consciousnesses, one cultivates the Path	Mahās 56	Ther 99; Sarv; *Śārīp* 75
Consciousness is a member of the Path	Sarv 66	Vātsīp 16
Knowledge is a member of the Path	Sarv 66; Vātsīp 16	
The Path has 5 members	Mahīś 30; Śārīp 58 ?	Ther 16
There is no *vicāra* in the noble Path	Bahuś 3	
With the exception of the Path, all is suffering	Hetuv 7	Ther 166
The aggregates are destroyed only by the Path	Sautr 2	Ther; Sarv; *Śārīp*
Suffering is abandoned by means of the Path	Haim 6	
Suffering leads to the path	Mahās 31	
To say: "O suffering" can help	Mahās 32	
To say "O suffering" makes one recognize the Path	Andh 43	Ther 111; Sarv
Suffering is a nutriment	Mahās 34; Pūrv 8	Ther 16
There is vocal utterance in the one who has entered into possession of the Path	Mahās 27, 30; Pūrv 7	Ther 15; Sarv 52
"	Bahuś 2; Cet 3	
The Path cannot be destroyed	Prajñ 12	
The 4 Fruits are obtained by one single Path	Uttar 30; some Andh 57	Ther 177; other Andh
The Material of the Saint is Path	Mahās 55; Mahīś 26	Ther 98

"	Samm 15; *Śārīp* 9	
The Path is non-composite	Mahās 43; Mahīś 19	Ther 21; Sarv 112
"	Vibh 9	*Śārīp* 10
The Path is mental	Ther; Sarv Prajñ 8	
"	*Śārīp* 59	
The Path and defilements arise together	Late Mahās 4	

Purity and Virtue

External material is *anāsrava*	Dārṣṭ 2	Sarv
The 4 *āsravas* are *anāsrava*	Hetuv 1	Ther 148
Vitarka and *vicāra* are *anāsrava*	Ther; Sarv 50	Mahīś 15
"	*Śārīp* 68	
The 5 faculties are only *anāsrava*	Mahās 38; Mahīś 13	Sarv 59; Ther
"	Vibh 3; *Śārīp* 69	
The virtue caused by *samādāna* increases	Mahās 60	Ther 105
Virtue is mental	Ther 103	Mahās 58; *Śārīp* 22
Virtue is the result of the mind	Ther 104	Mahās 59; *Śārīp* 22
Virtue is *vijñapti*	Mahās 61; Samm 16	Ther 106
Virāga is the abandoning of the fetters by practice	Vātsip 7	Sarv
Merit makes joy increase	Samm 9; Rājag 5	Ther 68
"	Siddh 5	
He who is endowed with the Path is provided with 2 virtues	Mahās 57	*Śārīp* 72; Ther 102
Methuna dhamma should be accomplished only with one single intention	Andh 70; Vetull 8	Ther 212
In non-humans, *methuna dhamma* is a holy practice	Some Uttar 44	Ther 213; other Uttar

Generosity

Generosity ripens in the other world	Rājag 6; Siddh 6	Ther 69
Generosity is mental	Rājag 4; Siddhi 4	Ther 67
The Saṃgha takes the gift	Ther 167	Vetull 1
The Saṃgha purifies the gift	Ther 168	Vetull 2
The Saṃgha enjoys the gift	Ther 169	Vetull 3
Generosity to the Saṃgha produces a great fruit	Ther 170; Mahīś 21	Vetull 4; Dharm 1
"	Sarv; *Satyasid* 12	
Generosity to the Buddha produces a great fruit	Ther 171; Dharm 1	Vetull 5; Mahīś 21
"	Sarv; *Satyasid* 12	
The donor purifies the gift	Uttar 27	Ther 172
Worship of a *caitya* produces a great fruit	Dharm 6; Mūlas 6	Cet 2; Pūrv 3
"	Late Mahīś 8; Apar 2	
One person hands down his happiness to another	Hetuv 5	Ther 156

The Truths and the Fruits

Saṃvṛtijñāna has as object only the Truth	Ther 49	Andh 21
3 Truths: suffering, conventional and noble	Bahuś 4	

The 4 Truths are non-composite	Pūrv 10	Ther 56; Sarv 8; *Śārīp* 32
The *abhisamaya* of the Truths is progressive	Andh 4; late Mahās 1	Ther 19; Vibh 17
"	Sarv 9; Samm 6	Mahīś 2; Mahās 23
"	Bhadr	
The *abhisamaya* of the Fruits is progressive	Andh 4; Samm 6	Ther 19; Sarv 24
"	Bhadr	
There is *abhisamaya* in the embryonic state	Some Uttar 40	Ther 207; other Uttar
There is *abhisamaya* in the dream	Some Uttar 41	Ther 208; other Uttar
The Arhant is endowed with the 4 Fruits	Uttar 4	Ther 37
The candidate for Arhant-hood has the 3 earlier Fruits	Some Andh 16	Ther 42; other Andh
One attains the 4 Fruits by one single Path	Uttar 30; some Andh 57	Ther 177; other Andh
The Śrāvaka has knowledge of the Fruit	Andh 25	Ther 53
The 4 Fruits are non-composite only	Pūrv 29; Vibh 32; *Śārīp* 11	Ther 184; Sarv 103
Entry into the Path of Deliverance		
There are 15 *pratipanna* minds	Sarv 12	Vātsīp 9; Samm 25
There are 12 *pratipanna* minds	Vātsīp 9; Samm 25	Sarv 12
There is *niyāma* and Fruit without meditation	Sarv 21	
The criminal can enter into *niyāma*	Uttar 20	Ther 127
The predestined can enter into *niyāma*	Pūrv 22; Apar 8	Ther 128
There is *niyāma* for the lay person	Uttar 33	Ther 188
There is *niyāma* by the seeing of just the suffering of composite phenomena	Dārṣṭ 43; Mahīś 35	Sarv 130
There is *niyāma* by meditation on *kāma*	Sarv 11	
There is *niyāma* only in *kāmadhātu*	Sarv 22; Vātsīp 32	
There is *niyāma* by *animittasamādhi* alone	Dharm 12	Sarv 10
Niyāma is non-composite	Andh 26; *Śārīp* 10	Ther 54; Sarv 6
"		Mahās 43; Mahīś 19
Only what is *prahina* is *parijñā*	Kaś 2	
There is deterioration from the 3 *prayogas* onward	Sarv 13	
The *laukikāgradharmas* are instantaneous	Sarv 13; 62	Vibh 34
The *laukikāgras* are fixed and without deterioration	Sarv 13	
There is *laukikāgra* in *kāmadhātu*	Mahās 77; Mahīś 36	Sarv 61; Vātsīp 35
"	Dharm 8	
There is *laukikāgra* in *rūpādhātu*	Mahās 77; Mahīś 36	
"	Dharm 8; Sarv 61	
"	Vātsīp 35	
There is *laukikāgra* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Vātsīp 35; Mahīś 36	Mahās 77; Sarv 61
"	Dharm 8	
There are *laukikāgra aparyāpannas*	Dharm 8	Mahās 77; Mahīś 36
"		Sarv 61; Vātsīp 35
The *laukikāgras* are the five faculties	Vātsīp 14	Sarv
Patience is knowledge	Dārṣṭ 35	Sarv 113
Pure patience is seeing	Sarv 113	Dārṣṭ 35
The *dhyānas* are included in the *smṛtyupasthānas*	Sarv 20	
The *mārgāṇgas* are in the *smṛtyupasthānas*	Mahīś 18	
Everything is included in the *smṛtyupasthānas*	Andh 1; Sarv 25	Ther 9

Good wisdom is seeing	Sarv 114	Dārṣṭ 53
The mistakes are abandoned only by seeing	Sarv 115	Vibh 15
"	Śārīp 47	
There are *bodhyaṇgas* in 7 absorptions	Sarv 19	
One becomes Buddha by Bodhi	Uttar 5; *Śārīp* 3	Ther 39

Regression

The Arhant may regress	Vātsīp 13; Samm 2, 14	Mahās 37; Mahīś 17
"	Sarv 14; Pūrv 15	Vibh 18; Ther 2, 84
"	Bhadr	
The Arhant regresses because of his actions	Pūrv 15; Samm 14	Ther 84
The Srotāpanna may regress	Mahās 37; Mahīś 17	Ther 3; Sarv 14
One can regress from *nirodhasamāpatti*	Dārṣṭ 41	Sarv
Regression is the production of defilements	Sarv	Vibh 18
There is regression from the path, not from the Fruit	Vibh 18	Sarv
Regression has no reality	Darṣṭ 59	Sarv
There is regression everywhere up to the *gotrabhūmis*	Mahās 36	

Deliverance and Extinction

He who knows deliverance is delivered	Andh 18	Ther 44
He who is attached to existence is not delivered	Sarv 44	
The deliverance of the Buddha is the same as		
that of the Śrāvakas	Sarv 43; Mahīś 22	
"	Dharm 2	
The *sarāga* mind is delivered	Andh 9; Vibh 23 ?	Ther 24; Sarv 80
"	Dārṣṭ 14	
There is abandonment of the fetters for the one who		
sees the benefit of virtue	Andh 38	Ther 85
The 2 cessations are non-composite	Mahīś 19; Mahās 43	Ther 21; Vātsīp 38
"	Sarv 6; Andh 6	
"	*Śārīp* 10; Sautr 9	
The 3 cessations really exist	Sarv 81	Darṣṭ 15; Sautr 9
Nirvāṇa is only *naivaśaikṣanāśaikṣa*	Sarv 83; Ther	Vibh 27,28; Vātsīp 19
"		*Śārīp* 12
Nirvāṇa is good	Andh 61; Sarv	Ther 187
"	*Śārīp* 12	
The *pudgala* survives in nirvāṇa	Haim 7 ?; Vātsīp 1 ?	Sarv; Ther
"	Samm 1 ?	
One should not say that nirvāṇa is the same		
or distinct from phenomena	Vātsīp 11	
One should not say that nirvāṇa exists or		
does not exist	Vātsīp 12	Sautr 9; Mahīś 1
"		Sarv; Darṣṭ 15
He who conquers the defilements is reborn		
in the higher realms	Dārṣṭ 27	Sarv 104
There is a fetter that has the immortal as object	Pūrv 16	Ther 86

Members of the Path and Deliverance

There are 41 parts to enlightenment	Vibh 19	Sarv
The 5 faculties are *anāsrava* only	Vibh 3; Mahās 38	Sarv 59; Ther
"	Mahīś 13; *Śārīp* 69	
The 5 faculties are supramundane only	Mahīś 13; Mahās 38	Sarv 36; Ther 189
"	Hetuv 8; *Śārīp* 7	
Right view is supramundane only	Ther; Mahās 38	Sarv 35
"	Śārīp 8; Mahīś 13 ?	
The 5 faculties are good only	Mahās 38; Mahīś 13	Sarv 60; Ther
"	Vibh 3; *Śārīp* 69	
"	Hetuv 8	
The beginner has the 5 faculties	Ther 27; *Śārīp* 36	Andh 11
Good wisdom is seeing	Sarv 114	Dārṣṭ 53
There are two simultaneous wisdoms	Mahīś 25	
Wisdom stops suffering	Mahās 33	
The nature of power is *virya*	Dharm 10	Sarv
The powers of the Buddha and of the Śrāvaka are shared in common	Andh 7	Ther 22; *Śārīp* 3
The means of existence are different from speech and actions	Darṣṭ 37	

The Liberating Knowledges

Knowledge is a member of the Path	Sarv 66; Vātsīp 16	
The power of the Buddha is a noble *jñāna*	Andh 8	Ther 23
The non-predestined has knowledges	Uttar 8	Ther 47
The layman has knowledges	Ther 191; Sarv	Hetuv 9; Uttar 8
"	Śārīp	
The Buddha sees the past and the future	Sautr 21	
The Buddha always has the 2 supreme *jñānas*	Mahās 15	
The Buddha knows everything with one single mind	Mahās 14	
The Buddha understands everything with one single *prajñā*	Mahās 13	
The *jñāna* of the *śaikṣa* is *aśaikṣa*	Uttar 7	Ther 45
Patience has the nature of knowledge	Dārṣṭ 35	Sarv 113
The Śrāvaka has knowledge of the Fruit	Andh 25	Ther 53
All Arhants have *anutpādajñāna*	Sarv 15	
Pṛthivīkṛtsna gives a wrong *jñāna*	Andh 19	Ther 46
All *jñāna* is *pratisaṃbhidā*	Andh 20	Ther 48
Saṃvṛtijñāna cognizes only the Path	Ther 49	Andh 21
Paracittajñāna cognizes only the mind	Andh 22	Ther 50
There is knowledge of the future	Andh 23; Sarv	Ther 51
"	Śārīp *76*	
There is knowledge of the present	Andh 24; Śārīp 76	Ther 52
One single *jñāna* cognizes everything		Sarv 64
The *lokottara jñāna* has 12 objects	Pūrv 31; Apar 10	Ther 195
The teachings were revamped by the Councils	Some Uttar 35	Ther 196; other Uttar
Tīrthikas have the 5 *abhijñās*	Sarv 17; Vātsīp 6	Haim 2 ?; Dharm 3
"		Mahīś 6
The divine eye is a fleshly eye	Andh 12; Samm 8	Ther 28*; Śārīp* 56

Sensory Knowledge

The 6 sensory spheres are maturation	Mahā C 69; *Śārīp* 24	Ther; Dārṣṭ 11; Mahā NW 54
The 6 sense spheres are established at conception	Pūrv 25; Apar 9	Ther 136
The 5 spheres are lustful	Pūrv 13	Ther 77
The 5 spheres exist in *rūpadhātu*	Andh 36; Samm 11	Ther 80; Sarv
"	Mahās 25	*Śārīp* 15
There is no sensory sphere in *rupadhātu*	Ther 80	Andh 36; Samm 11
"		Sarv; Mahās 25; *Śārīp* 15
The 5 sense faculties are visible	Andh ?	Ther 62; *Śārīp* 38
The eye sees form	Sarv; Śārīp 25	Ther 181; Sautr 17
"	Some Mahās 26	Darṣṭ 8; other Mahās 26
One eye alone sees	V atsīp 17	Sarv 69
The group of aggregates sees form	Darṣṭ 8	
Feeling alone is fruit	Dārṣṭ 11	Sarv 75; *Śārīp* 49
"		Ther; Mahās 54, 69
There is *saṃjñā* among the Asaṃjñins	Andh 13; Sarv	Ther 32
There is *saṃjñā* in *naivasaṃjñānāsaṃjñāyatana*	Ther 33	Andh 14
The contact of knowledge exists	Sarv 124	Dārṣṭ 39

The Object of Knowledge

There are knowledges without object	Andh 40; Darṣṭ 48	Ther 89; Sarv 91
Every knowledge has an objective domain	Sarv 91	Dārṣ t 48
The latent dispositions are without object	Mahās 45; Mahī 3	Ther 88; Sarv 26
"	Andh 39; Darṣṭ 13	Other Uttar
"	Some Uttar 13	
The *ālambanapratyaya* gives rise to consciousness	Samm 27	Sarv 136; Sautr 26
The *ālambanapratyaya* is the agglomerated atoms	Sautr 26	Sarv 136; Samm 27
The *ālambanapratyaya* is the atoms taken in isolation	Sarv 136	Samm 27; Sautr 26
The mind whose object is the future or the past is without object	Uttar 14; *Śārīp* 2	Ther 90,91; Sarv 1
The *satkāyadṛṣṭi* has a real object	Sarv 63	Dārṣṭ 6
Form is provided with object	Uttar 12	Ther 87; *Śārīp* 44; Sarv
The objects of the fetters exist	Sarv 99; Vātsīp 21	Dārṣṭ 25
Some fetters have the immortal as object	Pūrv 16	Ther 86
Citta and *caitta* have object	Sarv 34; Ther	
"	*Śārīp* 51	
The *dharmāyatana* is completely cognizable	Sarv 3; *Śārīp* 31	Mahās 48
"	Late Mahīś 3	
The knowable is expressible and inexpressible	V atsīp 10; Samm 26	
The five sense faculties are visible	Andh ?	Ther 62; *Śārīp* 38
Physical action is visible	Andh ?	Ther 63; *Śārīp* 53
Space is visible	Andh 28	Ther 60; *Śarīp* ?
The four great elements are visible	Andh 29	Ther 61; *Śārīp* 37

The Mental Formations

The *cittaviprayuktas* are among the *saṃskāras*	Sarv 4; *Śārīp* 63	Ther
Emptiness is among the *samskāras*	Andh 60	Ther 182
The latent tendencies are dissociated from the mind	Mahās 46, 63; Mahīś 3	Ther 108; Sarv 26
"	Vibh 39; *Śārīp* 5	Other Uttar
"	Dārṣṭ 13; Vātsīp 37	
"	Samm 17; Andh 39	
	Some Uttar 13	
Mind and mental events know each other	Mahīś 25	
Citta and *caitta* of the Srotāpanna know each other	Mahās 29	Sarv
Citta and *caitta* are *samanantarapratyaya*	Sarv 110	Dārṣṭ 52
The *caittas* know each other	Mahās 29	Sarv
Virtue is mental	Ther 103	Mahās 58; *Śārīp* 22
The Path is mental	Ther; Sarv; *Śārīp* 59	Prajñ 8
Citta and *caitta* alone are causes	Mahās 54	Sarv 75; Ther; *Śārīp* 49
Citta and *caitta* alone are fruits	Mahās 54; Ther	Sarv 75; Dārṣṭ 11; *Śārīp* 49
There are mental things	Ther 66; Sarv 34	Rājag 3; Siddh 3
"	*Śārīp 54*	
Generosity is mental	Rājag 4; Siddhi 4	Ther 67
Mental things have objects	Sarv 34; Ther	

"	*Śārīp* 51	
Cetanā is a mental action	Sarv; *Śārīp*	Sautr 24
There are physical and mental actions outside of *cetanā*	Sarv. 117; *Śārīp* 42	Dārṣṭ 54; Sautr 16
"	Ther; Mahīś 27, 28	Late Mahīś 4
Cetanā alone is cause	Dārṣṭ 11; Ther	Sarv 75; Mahās 54; *Śārīp* 49
Cetanā and *manojalpa* are thoughts	Dārṣṭ 19	Sarv 89; Ther; *Śārīp* 50
Every mind has *vitarka*	Uttar 15	Ther 92; Sarv; *Śārīp*
The six consciousnesses are associated with *vitarka*	Mahīś 11	
Citta and *caitta* evolve together	Sarv 110; Mahīś 20	
Vitarka and *vicāra* are mental events	Sarv 90; Ther; *Śārīp* 48	Dārṣṭ 47
Vitarka and *vicāra* are associated with the mind	Ther; Sarv 90	
"	*Śārīp* 48; late Mahī 6	
Vitarka and *vicāra* can be pure	Ther; Sarv 50; *Śārīp* 68	Mahīś 15
Vitarka and *vicāra* are everywhere	Dārṣṭ 23	Sarv 95; Ther; *Śārīp* 70
There is no *vicāra* in the noble Path	Bahuś 3	
Sound is the diffusion of *vitarka*	Pūrv 17	Ther 93
Having understood completely, one apprehends	Pūrv 27	Ther 157
Avijñapti exists really	Sarv 105; *Śārīp* 34	Ther
"	Mahās 62	Sautr 14; Dārṣṭ 29
Virtue is *vijñapti*	Mahās 61; Samm 16	Ther 106
Immorality is *avijñapti*	Mahās 62	Ther 107
Kāyavijñaptirūpa is shape	Sarv 140	Dārṣṭ 61; Vātsīp 40 Samm 28
"		
Kāyavijñapti is movement	Vātsīp 40; Samm 28	Sarv 140; Dārṣṭ 61
Kāyavijñapti is produced by the mind	Dārṣṭ 61	Sarv 140; Samm 28 Vātsīp 40
"		
Mind and mental events arise together	Sarv 72	Dārṣṭ 46

The Nature of Knowledge

Knowledge is a member of existence	Sarv 66	Vātsīp 16
There are consciousnesses without object	Andh 49; Dārṣṭ 48	Ther 89; Sarv 91
Every consciousness has an objective domain	Sarv 91	Dārṣṭ 48
The *jñānaviprayukta* mind is *jñāna*	Ther 109	Mahās 64
Consciousness is dissociated from the mind	Pūrv 20	Ther 110
There is consciousness of the future	Andh 23; Sarv	Ther 51
"	*Śārīp* 76	
There is consciousness of the present	Andh 24; *Śārīp* 76	Ther 52
One single *jñāna* cognizes everything		Sarv 64
Every *jñāna* is *pratisaṃbhidā*	Andh 20	Ther 48
Saṃvṛtijñāna cognizes only the Truth	Ther 49	Andh 21
Consciousness cognizes	Sarv 65	
The individual cognizes	Vātsīp 15	Sarv; Mahīś 32
Jñāna and *vijñāna* can be simultaneous	Sarv 68	Dārṣṭ 7
There is no ordinary meaning	Mahās 53	

Consciousness

Everything is included in *nāmarūpa*	Sarv 2; Ther	
Being endowed with 5 consciousnesses, one practices the Path	Mahās 56	Ther 99; Sarv; *Śārīp* 75
Consciousness is a member of the Path	Sarv 66	Vātsīp 16
Consciousness is a member of existence	Saerv 66; Vātsīp 16	
There is a persistent *bhavaṇgavijñāna*	Ther 219; Vibh 41	
There is subtle *manovijñāna* at conception, at death, in *nirodhasamāpatti*, etc.	Ther 218; Sautr 29	
There is a root consciousness	Mahās 78	
The heart is the organ of the *manovijñāṇa*	Ther 220	
The 5 consciousnesses are good or bad	Mahās ?	Ther 100; *Śārīp* 65
The 5 consciousnesses are *sarāga*	Mahīś 10; Mahās 24	Vātsīp 5; Samm 24
The 6 consciousnesses are associated with *vitarka-vicāra*	Mahīś 11	
The *manovijñāna* has as its objects those of the 5 sense *vijñānas*	Sarv 109	Dārṣṭ 32
The 6 consciousnesses also have internal objects	Sarv 109	Dārṣṭ 33
The 6 consciousnesses has as objects the internal faculties and the consciousnesses	Sarv 109	Dārṣṭ 33
The actively present 6 consciousnesses are seeds	Sautr 28	
The 5 consciousnesses are *sābhoga*	Mahās 76	Ther 101
The auditory consciousness follows the visual consciousness	Uttart 23	Ther 137
The 6 consciousnesses exist in *rupadhātu* and in *ārūpyadhātu*	Mahās 25	Ther 80, 81; Sarv, *Śārīp* 16
There are none of the 5 sense consciousnesses in the *rūpadhātu*	Ther 80	Mahās 25; Sarv, *Śārīp* 15
The 6 *vijñānas* have no simultaneous support	Sautr 30	
The consciousnesses can be simultaneous	Mahās 79	

The Mind

The mind of the Srotāpanna cognizes its nature	Mahās 29	Sarv
The mind cognizes it nature	Mahās 29	Sarv
Mind and mental events cognize each other	Mahīś 25	
There is mind in *asaṃjñāsamāpatti*	Darṣṭ 58; Vibh 5	Sarv
There is subtle mind in *nirodhasamāpatti*	Dārṣṭ 40; Vibh 6	Sarv 128
"	Sautr 29; Ther 217	
Mind and mental events arise together	Sarv 72	Dārṣṭ 46
Mind and mental events are mutual *samanantarapratyayas*	Sarv 110	Dārṣṭ 52
Mind and mental events evolve together	Mahīś 20; Sarv 110	Late Mahās 7
There is material in mind	Mahās 51	Ther; Sarv; *Śārīp* 71
Vitarka and *vicāra* are mind	Dārṣṭ 47	Sarv 90; Ther; *Śārīp* 48
The mind and the body are mutual seeds	Sautr 18	
Mind and mental events cognize that which is associated with mind	Dharm 9	Sarv
The mind is pure in nature	Mahās 44; Vibh 23	Sarv 80
"	Śārīp 6	
The *sarāga* mind is delivered	Andh 9; Vibh 23 ?	Ther 24; Sarv 80

"	Dārṣṭ 14	
Life is the result of the mind	Vibh 4; Ther	Sarv 125; *Śārīp* 64
Every mind has *vitarka*	Uttar 15	Ther 92; Sarv; *Śārīp*
Virtue is the result of the mind	Ther 104	Mahās 59; *Śārīp* 22
A mind can last for a very long time	Andh 3; *Śārīp* 26	Ther 17
Two minds arise together	Late Mahās 3	Sarv 67
The mind is *sarvatrāga*	Vibh 24	Sarv 74
One controls the mind of another	Mahās 74	Ther 154
Citta and *caitta* alone are causes	Mahās 54	Sarv 75; Ther
Consciousness is dissociated from the mind	Pūrv 20	Ther 110
Citta and *caitta* alone are fruits	Mahās 54; Ther	Sarv 75; Dārṣṭ 11; *Śārīp* 49
Mind penetrates the entire body	Late Mahās 8	
Speech is in harmony with the mind	Ther 94; late Mahīś	Pūrv 18
Physical action is in harmony with the mind	Ther 95; late Mahīś 5	Pūrv 19
Cetanā and *manojalpa* are minds	Dārṣṭ 19	Sarv 89; Ther; *Śārīp* 50
The cognizing mind does not have ignorance	Dārṣṭ 36	Sarv 116
The uncertain mind does not have certainty	Dārṣṭ 36	Sarv 116
The coarse mind does not have subtlety	Dārṣṭ 36	Sarv 116
The mind exists	Sarv 34	
The mind has object	Sarv 34; Ther; *Śārīp* 52	
The mind is dissociated from the mind	Sarv 34	Ther; *Śārīp* 52
The mind dissociated from knowledge does not cognize	Mahās 64	Ther 109

The Continuity of the Mind

Rāga and *pratigha* alone are factors of *cittasantati*	Dārṣṭ 26	Sarv 102
All the *kleśas* are factors of *cittasantati*	Sarv 102	Dārṣṭ 26
The defiled mind alone is factor of *cittasantati*	Sarv 101	Vibh 36
The pure mind is a factor of *cittasantati*	Vibh 36	Sarv 101
In *ārūpyadhātu*, *cittasantati* has no other support than itself	Sautr 22	Sarv
Meditation is *cittasantati*	Sarv 58; Uttar 16	Ther 113

Sleep and Dreams

There is *abhisamaya* during dream	Some Uttar 41	Ther 208; other Uttar
There is attainment of sainthood in dream	Some Uttar 41	Ther 208; other Uttar
The dream mind is indeterminate	Some Uttar 42	Ther 209; other Uttar
The dream really exists	Sarv 84	Dārṣṭ 16
The Buddha never sleeps or dreams	Mahās 19; Vibh 13	Sarv

The Dhyānas

The Arhant attains the *dhyanas*	arv 39	
The Srotāpanna attains the *dhyanas*	Mahās 50; Mahīś 31	Sarv 57
"	Vibh 37	
The Sakṛdāgāmin attains the *dhyanas*	Vibh 37	Sarv 57
One enters into *niyāma* by meditating on lust	Sarv 11	
One can acquire *niyāma* and the Fruit of Arhant		

without *dhyāna*	Sarv 21		
All the *dhyānas* have *aṇgas*	Sarv 129; Ther; *Śārīp* 77	Vibh 21	
In the first three *dhyanas*, happiness is purely physical	Dārṣṭ 5	Sarv	
The concentrated one enjoys meditation	Andh 46	Ther 131	
Pṛthivīkṛtsna gives *viparītajñāna*	Andh 19	Ther 46	
There are spaces between the *dhyanas*	Samm 22; Sarv	Mahīś 29; other Andh 58	
"	Some Andh 59		
There are *lokottara dhyānas*	Sarv 49; Ther; *Śārīp* 67	Mahīś 14	
There is mixing of the *dhyanas*	Dārṣṭ 42	Sarv	
All the *dhyanas* are in the *smṛtyupasthānas*	Sarv 20		
The Arhant becomes extinguished in *āneñjya*	Some Uttar 39	Ther 206; Sarv 42	
"		Other Uttar	
The *āneñjya* is non-composite	Mahīś 19	Sarv 6; Ther 21	
"		Śārīp 10; Mahās 43	
In *dhyana* one is provided with the three times	Andh 41	Ther 96	
The close stages are good only	Dārṣṭ 55	Sarv	
One can stay on the eighth stage for a long time	Mahās 35		

Meditation

There is *bodhyaṇga* only in the 7 *samāpattis*	Sarv 19		
One enters into *samādhi* by seeing the suffering of the composite phenomena	Bahuś 5		
There is vocal emission in *samādhi*	Mahās 27, 30; Pūrv 7	Ther 15; Sarv 52	
"	Bahuś 2; Cet 3		
"	Haim 5; Apar 7		
Saying: "O suffering" makes one understand suffering	Andh 43	Ther 111; Sarv	
There is disciplined mind in *samādhi*	Mahās 27		
One hears sound in *samāpatti*	Pūrv 28	Ther 180	
Buddha always remains in *samādhi*	Mahās 12; Vibh 12	Sarv	
Samādhi is *cittasantati*	Sarv 58; Uttar 16	Ther 113	
Samādhi is only mind-concentration	Sautr 32	Sarv	
One enters into *niyāma* only by *animittasamādhi*	Dharm 12	Sarv 10	
There is mind in *asaṃjñāsamāpatti*	Dārṣṭ 58; Vibh 5	Sarv	
There is *saṃjñā* among the Asaṃjñins	Andh 13; Sarv	Ther 32	
There is *saṃjñāvedayitanirodha* among the Asaṃjñins	Hetuv 4	Ther 152	
There is death in *saṃjñāveditayitanirodha*	Rājag 8	Ther 151	
Samjñāvedayitanirodha is *lokottara*	Hetuv 2	Ther 150	
Saṃjñāvedayitanirodha is *laukika*	Hetuv 3	Ther 150	
One does not die in meditation	Sarv 42		
There is *samjñā* in *naivasaṃjñānāsaṃjñāyatana*	Ther 33	Andh 14	
Nirodhasamāpatti is non-composite	Andh 27; Uttar 9	Ther 58; Sarv 6	
"		*Śārīp* 10; Mahās 43; Mahīś 19	
There is subtle mind in *nirodhasamāpatti*	Dārṣṭ 40; Vibh 6	Sarv 128	
"	Sautr 29; Ther 217		
There is regression from *nirodhasamāpatti*	Dārṣṭ 41	Sarv	

The Threefold World

There are worldly things	Dharm 7; Sarv; *Śārīp* 45	
The 3 *rāśis* exist everywhere	Dārṣṭ 44	
There are 6 destinies	Andh 34; Uttar 11	Ther 74; Sarv
"	Vātsīp 36	*Śārīp* 18
The *dṛṣṭivant* abandons the *durgatis*	Uttar 18	Ther 121
The Bodhisattva goes into the *durgatis*	Andh 71; Cet 1; Pūrv 1	Ther 214
"	Mahās 22; Sarv	
"	Apar 1; Haim 1 ?	

Kāmadhātu

Only in *kāmadhātu* does one enter into *niyāma*	Sarv 22; Vātsīp 32	
There are *laukikāgradharmas* in *kāmadhātu*	Mahās 77; Mahīś 36	Sarv 61; Vātsīp 35
"	Dharm 8	
Èrṣyā and *matsara* exist only in *kāmadhātu*	arv 97	Vibh 35
The 5 *kāmaguṇas* are *kāmadhātu*	ūrv 12	Ther 76
Outside of *kāmadhātu*, *śīlavrataparāmarśā* and *vicikitsā* are indeterminate	Vubh 30	Sarv 132

Rūpadhātu

There are 6 *vijñānas* in *rūpadhātu*	Mahās 25	Ther 80; Sarv; *Śārīp* 15
There are 4 *vijñānas* in *rūpadhātu*	Sarv; *Śārīp* 15	Mahās 25; Ther 80
There is only 1 *vijñāna* in *rūpadhātu*	Ther 80	Mahās 25; Sarv; *Śārīp* 15
There are 6 *āyatanas* in *rūpadhātu*	Andh 36; Samm 11	Ther 80; Sarv
"	Mahās 25	*Ś arīp* 15
There are 4 *āyatanas* in *rūpadhātu*	Sarv; *Śārīp* 15	Ther 80; Andh 36
"		Samm 11; Mahās 25
There is only 1 *āyatana* in *rūpadhātu*	Ther 80	Sarv; *Śārīp* 15
"		Mahās 25; Andh 36
There is *rūparāga* in *rūpadhātu*	Andh 49, 54; Samm 18	Ther 141
Material things are *rūpadhātu*	Andh 35	Ther 78
There are *laukikāgradharmas* in *rūpadhātu*	Sarv 61; Vātsīp 35	
"	Mahās 77; Mahīś 36; Dharm 8	
There are *īrṣyā* and *matsara* in Brahmaloka	Vibh 35	Sarv 97

Ārūpyadhātu

There are *laukikāgradharmas* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Vātsīp 35; Mahīś 36	Sarv 61; Mahās 77
"	Dharm 8	
There is *arūparāga* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Andh 49, 54; Samm 18	Ther 141
There are 6 *vijñānas* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Mahās 25	Ther 81; Sarv; *Śārīp* 16
There is only 1 *vijñāna* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Ther 81; Sarv; *Śārīp* 16	Mahās 25
The *arūpin dharmas* are *ārūpyadhātu*	Andh ?	Ther 79
There is *rūpa* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Andh 37, 53; *Śārīp* 13	Ther 81; Sarv 108
"	Mahās 25; Vibh 20	
The 4 *ārūpyasamāpattis* are non-composite	Mahās 43; *Śārīp* 10	Ther 57; Sarv 6
		Mahīś 19; Vātsīp 38

In *ārūpyadhātu*, *cittasantati* has no other support than itself	Sautr 22	Sarv

Supramundane things

Laukikāgradharmas are *aparyāpanna*	Dharm 8	Sarv 61; Vātsīp 35
"		Mahās 77; Mahīś 36
The Buddha is supramundane	Mahās 1; Vetull 6	
The *vohāra* of the Buddha is supramundane	Andh 5	Ther 20
Saṃjñāvedayitanirodha is *lokottara*	Hetuv 2	Ther 150
Saṃjñāvedayitanirodha is *laukika*	Hetuv 3	Ther 150
The 5 faculties are only *lokottara*	Mahās 38; Mahīś 13	Ther 189; Sarv 36
	Hetuv 8; *Śārīp* 7	
Right view is alone *lokottara*	Mahās 38; Mahīś 13 ?Sarv 35	
"	Ther; *Śārīp* 8	
The Saṃgha is supramundane	Bahuś 6; Vetull 1-3	Ther 167-169
Dṛṣṭigata is *aparyāpanna*	Pūrv 26	Ther 143
The death of the *lokottara* ones is *lokottara*	Mahās 73	Ther 149; *Śārīp* 74
There are *lokottara dhyānas*	Sarv 49; Ther; *Śārīp* 67	Mahīś 14
The *lokottara jñāna* has 12 objects	Pūrv 31; Apar 19	Ther 195
5 points of teaching are *lokottara*	Bahuś 1	

Form

There is *rūpa* in *rūpadhātu*	Andh 36, 53; Mahā 24	Ther 80
"	*Śārīp* 15; Samm 11; Sarv	
"	Vibh 20; Samm 11	
There is *rūpa* in *ārūpyadhātu*	Andh 37; 53; Mahās 25	Ther 81; Sarv 108
"	Vibh 20; *Śārīp* 13	
The form of the Saint is Path	Mahīś 26; Mahās 55	Ther 98
"	Samm 15; *Śārīp* 9	
Citta and *rūpa* are mutually seeds of each other	Sautr 18	
Rūpa is *rūpasahabhūhetu*	Sarv	
External form is *anāsrava*	Dārṣṭ 2	Sarv
Form is fruit of action	Sarv 75, 76; *Śārīp* 20, 29	Mahās 54; Ther 159
"	Uttar 26	Dārṣṭ 11
Form is the maturation of action	Andh 52; Samm 21	Ther 161; Mahās 54
"	Mahās 69	Dārṣ t 11
"	Sarv 75, 76; *Śārīp* 29	
Form is cause	Sarv 75, 76; *Śārīp* 29	Mahās 54; Ther 158
"	Uttar 26; Mahī 28?; Samm 12?	
Form is action	Samm 12; Mahīś 28	Ther 82
Form is cause and what is caused	Uttar 26; Śārīp 29	Ther 159; Mahās 54
"		Dārṣṭ 11
Form is good or bad	Mahīś 27, 28; Samm 13, 20	Ther 82, 160; Mahās 54
"	*Śārīp* 14	Dārṣṭ 11?
Noble form is derivative of the *mahābhutas*	Uttar 24; *Śārīp* 30	Ther 138
There is form in the mind	Mahās 51	Ther; Sarv; *Śārīp* 71
Rūpin dharmas are *rūpadhātu*	Andh 35	Ther 78

Arūpin dharmas are *arūpadhātu*	Andh ?	Ther 79
Form has object	Uttar 12	Ther 87; *Śārīp* 44; Sarv
Everything is included in *nāmarūpa*	Sarv 2; Ther	
The atom has extension	Sautr 25	Sarv 135
The atoms touch one another	Sautr 25	Sarv 135
The 4 great elements are visible	Andh 29	Ther 61; *Śārīp* 37
The great elements evolve	Mahīś 20; late Mahās ?	
The earth is maturation of action	Andh 30; *Śārīp* 28	Ther 70
The earth element lasts for a *kalpa*	Late Mahīś 7	
Sounds and images exist	Sarv 106	Dārṣṭ 50, 51
Sound is maturation of action	Mahās 68; Vibh ?	Ther 118; Sarv 121
“	Vātsīp 22; *Śārīp* 23	
Sound is diffusion of *vitarka*	Pūrv 17	Ther 93

Body and Life

The body of the Buddha is infinite	Mahās 6	
The life of the Buddha is eternal	Mahās 8	
The mind penetrates the entire body	Late Mahās 8	
The vital faculty does not exist	Sautr 15	
Life follows the mind	Vibh 4; Ther	*Śārīp* 64; Sarv 125
The vital faculty is material	Ther 83	Pūrv 14; Samm 13
“		Sarv; *Śārīp* 21
There is an intermediate existence	Pūrv 11; Samm 10	Ther 75; Vibh 7
“	Sarv 31	Mahās 49; Mahīś 8
“	Vātsīp 33; late Mahīś 2	*Śārīp* 4

Embryonic Life and Birth

The 6 *āyatanas* exist from conception onward	Pūrv 25; Apar 9	Ther 136
The Bodhisattva does not become *arbuda*, *kalala*, etc.	Mahās 18	
There is *abhisamaya* in the embryo	Some Uttar 40	Ther 207; other Uttar
There is acquistion of Sainthood in the embryo	Some Uttar 41	Ther 208; other Uttar
The embryo Bodhisattva has neither *kāma* nor *vyāpāda*	Mahās 21; Vibh 36; Haim 4	Sarv 101
The Bodhisattva is conceived as a white elephant	Mahās 19	
The Bodhisattva is born from his mother’s right side	Mahās 20	
Birth increases the *saṃskāras*	Mahīś 33	

Death

There can be premature death	Sarv 126	Prajñ 6; Dārṣṭ 57
There can be premature death for the Arhant	Ther 163; Sarv 126	Rājag 9; Siddhi 7
“		Prajñ 6; Dārṣṭ 57
One can die in *saṃjñānirodhasamāpatti*	Rājag 8	Ther 151
The death of those who are *lokottara* is *lokottara*	Mahās 73	Ther 149; *Śārīp* 74
One can die in meditation		Sarv 42
The Arhant becomes exrtinguished in *āneñjya*	Some Uttar 30	Ther 206; Sarv 42
“		Other Uttar
Old age and death are maturation	Andh 31	Ther 71; *Śārīp* 55

Old age and death are complete realities	Andh 45	Ther 115

Ontology

Everything exists, in particular the past and the future	Sarv 1; late Mahīś 1	Ther 7; Sautr 10
"		Mahīś 1; Mahās 47
"		*Śārīp* 2; Andh 2
The mind that has future or past objects has no object	Uttar 14; *Śārīp* 2	Ther 90, 91; Sarv 1
The *pudgala* exists	Vātsīp 1; Samm 1	Ther 1; Sautr 3, 99
"	Haim 7 ?	Dārṣṭ 25; Sarv 46
"		*Śārīp* 1;Tāmraś
Some past exists	Kāś 1	Ther 8; Sarv 1, 77
"		Andh 2; Mahās 47
"		Mahīś 1; *Śārīp* 2
All things exist and do not exist at the same time	Andh 2; Prajñ	Ther 10; Sarv 1
` "	*Satyasid* 6	Mahīś 1; *Śārīp* 2
Everything is merely denomination	Mahās; Ekav	Sarv 1; Ther 7
"	Prajñ; *Satyasid* 2	Mahīś 1
All composites are merely denominations	Prajñ	Sarv
Only the supramundane things exist	Lokot	Sarv 1; Ther 7
"		Mahīś 1; Ekav
"		Prajñ; Andh 2
All things are merely ashes	Gokul	Ther 18
There are 2 kinds of emptiness	Lokot	Ther; Sarv; *Śārīp* 46
There are 2 Truths, conventional and absolute	Prajñ; *Satyasid* 1	
"	Sarv	
Suffering is absolute reality	Prajñ 4	
Suffering is *parinișpanna*	Hetuv 10; some Uttar 45	Ther 216; other Uttar 45
Dharmasthititā is *parinișpanna*	Andh 44	Ther 114
Impermanence is *parinișpanna*	Andh 45	Ther 115
Old age and death are *parinișpanna*	Andh 45	Ther 115
Skandha, dhātu, indriya are *parinișpanna*	Ther 216; some Uttar 45	Hetuv 10; other Uttar 45
"		Prajñ 2 ?
The *āyatanas* are complete realities	Ther 216; Sarv 1	Prajñ 2
The nature of the lay person exists	Sarv 94	Dārṣṭ 20
Buddha exists as substance	Mahās 17	
The non-composites exist	Sarv 1; Mahīś 1	Sautr 9; *Satyasid* 18
The 3 *nirodhas* exist	Sarv 81	Dārṣṭ 15; Sautr 9
"		*Satyasid* 18
Space exists	Sarv 1; Mahīś 1	Sautr 9; *Satyasid* 18
The *prāptis* exist	Sarv 111	Sautr 11; Dārṣṭ 34
Duration exists	Sarv; *Śārīp* 61	Sautr 13; Ther
"		Mahīś 23
The vital faculty exists	Sarv	Sautr 15
Physical action exists	Sarv 117	Sautr 16; Dārṣṭ 54
Co-existing causes exist	Sarv	Sautr 19
Conditions in the nature of causes exist	Sarv 71, 98	Dārṣṭ 9
Dream exists	Sarv 84	Dārṣṭ 16

Characteristics exist	Sarv 7, 86	Dārṣ t 17
The fetters exist	Dārṣṭ 25; Sarv 99	
"	Vātsīp 21	
The objects of the fetters exist	Sarv 99; Vātsīp 21	Dārṣṭ 25
Magical things exist	Sarv 123	Dārṣṭ 38, 56
The contact of knowledge exists	Sarv 124	Dārṣṭ 39
The mental events exist	Sarv 34; Ther 66; *Śārīp* 54	Rājag 3; Siddh 3
Sounds and images exist	Sarv 106	Dārṣṭ 50, 51
Beings are only denominations of successive existences	Sarv 46	
The graspable is merely denomoination	Vātsīp 2	
Geometric shape is only denomination	Sautr 23	Sarv
Regression is only denomination	Dārṣṭ 59	Sarv
All things are fixed as to their self nature	Andh 66; some Uttar 37	Ther 202; other Uttar
There are no thngs included in other things	Rājag 1; Siddh 1	Ther 64; *Śārīp* 39
There are no things associated with other things	Rājag 2; Siddhi 2	Ther 65; *Śārīp* 40
The 4 aggregates are fixed as to their self nature	Sautr 6	
Everything is included in self nature	Sarv 100	Vibh 31
The great elements evolve	Mahīś 20; late Mahās 7	
Mind and mental events evolve	Mahīś 20; Sarv 110	Late Mahās 7
Action and its fruit evolve together	Late Mahās 5	
The abandonment of the roots of good has no self nature	Dārṣṭ 60	Sarv

The Non-composites

The non-composites exist	Sarv 1; Mahīś 1	Sautr 9; *Satyasid* 18
The non-composites are causes	Sarv	Sautr 20; Ther
"		Śārīp 62
Nirvāṇa alone is non-composite	Ther 21; Vātsīp 38	Sarv 6; Mahās 43
"	Samm ?	Mahiś 19; Andh 6, 26, 27
"		*Śārīp* 10; Vibh 8, 9, 29
"		Uttar 10, 32; Dharm 13
"		Sautr 9; *Satyasid* 17
The 2 cessations are non-composite	Sarv 6; Sautr 9	Ther 21; Vātsīp 38
"	Mahās 43; Andh 6	
"	Mahīś 19; *Śārīp* 10	
Space is non-composite	Mahīś 19; Sarv 6	Ther 59; Vātsīp 38
"	Uttar 10; Mahās 43	*Śārīp* 10
"	Sautr 9; *Satyasid* 17	
Pratītyasamutpāda is non-composite	Mahās 43; Mahīś 19	Ther 55; Sarv 6, 28
"	Dharm 13; Vibh 8	Vātīp 38
"	Pūrv 9; *Śārīp* 10	
Dharmasthitatā is non-composite	Śārīp 10	Sarv 6; Ther 21
"		Mahās 43; Mahīś 19
Tathatā is non-composite	Mahīś 19; some Uttar 32	Ther 186; Sarv 6
"		*Śārīp* 10; other Uttar
"		Mahās 43
The Path is non-composite	Mahās 43; Mahīś 19	Sarv 6, 112; Ther 21
"	Vibh 9	*Śārīp* 10

Niyāma is non-composite	Andh 26; *Śārīp* 10	Ther 54; Sarv 6
"		Mahās 43; Mahīś 19
Āneñjya is non-composite	Mahīś 19	Sarv 6; Ther 21
"		*Śārīp* 10; Mahās 43
The 4 *ārūpyasamāpatties* are non-composite	Mahās 43; Śārīp 10	Ther 57; Sarv 6
"		Mahīś 19
Nirodhasamāpatti is non-composite	Andh 27; Uttar 9	Ther 58; Sarv 6
"		*Śārīp* 10; Mahās 43
"		Mahīś 19
The characteristics are non-composite	Vibh 29	Sarv 87; Ther 21; Dharm 11
Nirodhalakṣaṇa is non-composite	Dharm 11; Vibh 29	Sarv 87. Ther 21
Anityānirodha is non-composite	Vibh 26	Sarv 82; Ther 21
The 4 Fruits alone are non-composite	Pūrv 29; Vibh 32	Ther 184; Sarv 103
"	Śārīp 11	
The *prāptis* are non-composite	Pūrv 30	Ther 185; Sarv 6; *Śārīp* 10
The 4 Truths are non-composite	Pūrv 10	Ther 56; Sarv 8; *Śārīp* 32

The Composites

All the composites ae merely denominations	Prajñ 3	Sarv 1
All the composites are suffering	Hetuv 7; Prajñ 3	Ther 166
One enters into *niyāma* by meditating on the suffering of the composites	Dārṣṭ 43; Mahīś 35	Sarv 130
One enters into *samādhi* by seeing the suffering of the composites	Bahuś 5	
The composites have only 2 times	Dārṣṭ 47	Sarv

Characteristics of the Composites

The characteristics are non-composite	Vibh 29	Dharm 11; Sarv 87; Ther 21
The characteristics are attribnuted to the moment	Sarv 139; Sautr 27	Samm 29
The characteristics are attributed to a prolonged state	Samm 29; Sautr 27	Sarv 139
Things arise in 4 ways	Late Mahās 2	
Things arise one after another	Dārṣṭ 24	Sarv 96
Duration exists	Sarv; *Śārīp* 61	Sautr 13; Ther; Mahīś 23
Nirodhalakṣaṇa is non-composite	Dharm 11; Vibh 29	Sarv 87; Ther 21
Cessation has a cause	Sarv 78	Dārṣṭ 12
The 3 cessations exist	Sarv 81	Dārṣṭ 15; Sautr 9; *Satyasid* 18
Everything can be destroyed	Mahīś 34	
Destruction exists	Mahās 52	
All things are instantaneous	Pūrv 32; Apar 11	Ther 211
"	Mahīś 23; Sarv 47	
"	Kāś 5; Vātsīp 4	
The aggregates last for an instant, a whole lifetime, or to the end of samsāra	Mahīś 37	
The composites have only 2 times	Dārṣṭ 49	Sarv
Everything is impermanent	Sautr 8	
Anityatānirodha is non-composite	Vibh 26	Sarv 82; Ther 21

Impermanence is *parinișpanna*	Andh 45	Ther 115
Time is permanent	Dārṣṭ 30; Vibh 33	Sarv
5 points of teaching are *lokottara*	Bahuś 1	

Time and Space

The moment has 3 characteristics	Sarv 88	Dārṣṭ 18
There is no future cause	Kāś 3	Sarv; Sautr 19
One is provided with things of the 3 times	Andh 41	Ther 96
There is knowledge of the future	Andh 23; Sarv	Ther 51
"	*Śārīp* 76	
There is knowledge of the present	Andh 24; *Śārīp* 76	Ther 52
One abandons the defilements of the 3 times	Sarv; some Uttar 31	Ther 182; other Uttar
The latent dispositions are eternally present	Late Mahīś 9	
The aggregates, etc., are eternally present	Late Mahīś 10	
Time is dsitnct from the aggregates	Dārṣṭ 30; Vibh 33	Sarv 107
Time is permanent	Dārṣṭ 30; Vibh 33	Sarv
The *prāptis* exist	Sarv 111	Sautr 11; Dārṣṭ 34
The *prāptis* are non-composite	Pūrv 39	Ther 185; Sarv 6
Theory of seeds	Sautr 12	Sarv; Ther 222
Mind and matter are seeds of one another	Sautr 18	
The seeds become shoots	Late Mahās 6	
The previous moment perfumes the later moment	Dārṣṭ 62	
Emptiness is in the *saṃskāraskandha*	Andh 60	Ther 183
Space is non-composite	Uttar 10; Mahīś 19	Ther 59; Vātsīp 38
"	Sarv 6; Sautr 9	*Śārīp* 10
"	Satyasid 17; Mahās 43	
Space is visible	Andh 28	Ther 60; *Śārīp* ?

The Person

The *pudgala* exists	Vātsīp 1; Haim 7?	Ther 1; Sarv 99
"	Samm 1	Sautr 3; Darṣṭ 25
"		Śārīp 1; Tāmraś
The indestructible, born with the action, produces the fruit	Samm 30	
The *pudgala* is neither the same as nor different from the aggregates	Vātsīp 1; Samm 1	
The *pudgala* transmigrates	V atsīp 3; Samm 1 ?	Mahīś 24; Ther 1
"		Sarv 48; *Śārīp* 1
The *pudgala* cognizes	Vātsīp 15	Sarv 3; Mahīś 32
Beings are merely *prajñapti* of the *bhavas*	Sarv 46	
The 5 aggregates transmigrate	Sautr 1; Samm 23 ?	Sarv; Ther; Vātsīp 3
"		Mahīś 24; *Śārīp* 41
The *pudgala* subsists in nirvāṇa	Vātsīp 1 ?; Samm 1 ? Sarv 3; Ther 1	
"	Haim 7 ?	
There is a root consciousness	Mahās 78	
There is a consciousness member of existence which persists	Ther 219; Vibh 41	

There is an aggregate which lasts until the end of transmigration	Mahīś 37	

Suffering

To say: "O suffering" brings knowledge of suffering	Andh 43	Ther 111; Sarv
To say: "O suffering" can help	Mahās 32	
Suffering leads to the Path	Mahās 31	
Suffering is a nutriment	Pūrv 8; Mahās 34	Ther 16
That which is bound to the faculties is suffering	Hetuv 6	Ther 165
All the composites are suffering	Hetuv 7; Prajñ 3	Ther 166
One enters into *niyāma* by the suffering only of the composites	Dārṣṭ 43; Mahīś 35	Sarv 130
One enters into *samādhi* by seeing the suffering of the composites	Bahuś 5	
Suffering is *parinișpanna*	Hetuv 10; some Uttar 45	Ther 216; other Uttar
Suffering is an absolute reality	Prajñ 4	
Suffering is different from the aggregates	Prajñ 1	
Wisdom makes suffering cease	Mahās 33	
There are 3 Truths: suffering, conventional and noble	Bahuś 4	
The teaching of suffering is *lokottara*	Bahuś 1	

The Aggregates

The aggregates have a root and an end	Sautr 4	
The ggregates have only one taste	Sautr 4	
The 4 aggregates are fixed as to their self nature	Sautr 6	
The 5 aggregates trnsmigrate	Sautr 1; Samm 23 ?	Sarv 48; Ther
"		Vātsīp 3
"		Mahīś 14; *Śārīp* 41
The 5 aggregtes are causes	Sarv 75; *Śārīp* 49	Ther; Mahās 54
"		Darṣṭ 11
The 5 aggregates are fruits	Sarv 75; *Śārīp* 49	Ther; Mahās 54
"		Dārṣṭ 11
The aggregates are *parinișpanna*	Ther 216; some Uttar 45	Hetu 10; other Uttar
"		Prajn 2 ?
Suffering differs from the aggregates	Prajñ 1	
There is continuity between the aggregates of two successive lives	Andh 42	Ther 97
Only the Path destroys the aggregates	Sautr 2	Ther; Sarv
"		*Śārīp*
The aggregates have *mūlapatti*s	Sautr 7	
Time is distinct from the aggregates	Dārṣṭ 30; Vibh 33	Sarv 107
The aggregates exist forever	late Mahīś 10	
There is one aggregate that lasts until the end of transmigration	Mahīś 37	
There are new beings	Mahīś 38	
The aggregates all together see forms	Dārș t 8	

Buddha and the Listener can perform miracles	Andh 64	Ther 199
One can last for a *kalpa* by means of magic	Mahās 65	Ther 112
Matter is cause	Sarv 75, 76; *Śārīp* 29	Mahās 54; Ther 158
"	Uttar 26; Mahīś28?; Samm12?	Dārṣṭ 11
Matter is the fruit of action	Sarv 75, 76; *Śārīp20*, 29	Mahās 54; Ther 159
"	Uttar 26	Dārṣṭ 11
Matter is maturation of action	Andh 52; Samm 21	Ther 161; Mahās NW 54
"	Sarv 75, 76; *Śārīp* 20	Dārṣṭ 11
"	Mahās C 69	<290>

APPENDIX II

Doctrinal Affinities

Examination of the collected 500 plus theses allows us to recognize the doctrinal affinities existing between the various sects. We may first notice that the sources are rarely contradictory, approximately ten times. We may also note that almost always the contradictions concern groups of sects, such as the Mahāsāṇghikas, or sects being possessed by various schools, such as the Mahīśāsakas. In these cases, the contradiction is only apparent since we know that the schools of such and such a group were themselves in disagreement on such and such a problem, as Vasumitra in particular has pointed out. What is especially striking and truly remarkable is the accord, on the other hand, between the various sources, so different nevertheless in their doctrinal and geographical origins.

Examination of the theses presents, however, a major difficulty. Actually, in 90 percent of the cases, we know only partially what sects or what schools held them and which others refuted them. Most of the time it is a matter of purely local problems which existed only in one region or among the schools of the same sect. This is why the meticulous study of the three *Abhidharmapiṭakas* in our possession does not permit us - far from it - to know the opinion of the sects of whom they are the doctrinal expression on the majority of these problems. It is hard to find much more than 100 questions shared by the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādins, more than 80 shared by the Theravādins and the sect of the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, and more than 70 shared by the latter and the Sarvāstivādins, which is very few in contrast to the collection of theses gathered together here which, as we have seen, is more than 500.

Nevertheless, there are 44 problems on which we have good information. In regard to them, we know the doctrinal position of the Sarvāstivādins in 42 cases, that os the Theravādins in 39 cases, that of the Śāriputrābhidharmikas in 30 cases, that of the Mahāsāṇghikas in 31 cases, that of the Mahīśāsakas in 28 cases, that of the Sammatīyas in 20 cases, that of the Vibhajyavādins[1498] in 17 cases, that of the Vātsīputrīyas in 18 cases and that of the Andhakas in 15 cases. In studying these problems, which could be called the great general problems of the Hinayāna since they have worried the Buddhists of Ceylon as well as those of Kashmir, the Theravādins as well as the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Mahiśāsakas as well as the Andhakas or the Sammatīyas, it is therefore possible to derive some information on the doctrinal affinities of different sects. <291>

1. Five theses of Mahādeva on the Arhant.

Agree: Mahās, Pūrv, Bahuś, Cetiya, Haimav

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, Samm, Vātsip, Mahīś

Appendix II

[1498] This is the sect so called in the Sarvāstivādin *Vibhāṣā.*

2. The individual (*pudgala*) exists.

Agree: Vātsip, Samm

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, *Śārip*, Sautr, Dārṣṭ, Mahīś

3. Everything exists (*sarvam asti*).

Agree: Sarv, late Mahīś

Disagree Mahāṣ, Mahīś, Ther, Vibh, *Śārip*, Andh, Sautr, Dārṣṭ ?, Uttar

4. There is an intermediate existence (*antarābhava*).

Agree: Sarv, Samm, Pūrv, late Mahīś, Darṣṭ

Disagree: Mahāṣ, mahīś, Ther, Vibh, *Śārip*

5. The *anuśayas* are *cittaviprayukta*.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Vibh, *Śārip*, Dārṣṭ, Vātsip, Samm, Andh, some Uttar

Disagree: Ther, Sarv

6. The *anuśayas* are different from the *paryavasthānas*.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Vibh, Andh

Disagree: Ther, Sarv

7.The *paryavasthānas* are *cittaprayukta*.

Agree: Andh

Disaogree: Mahās, Mahīś,Vibh, Ther Sarv

8.The *anuśayas* are *anālambana*.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Andh, Dārṣṭ, some Uttar

Disagree: Ther, Sarv

9. The Arhant can regress.

Agree: Samm, Vātsīp, Sarv, late Mahās, Pūrv

Disagree: Mahās, Mahīś, Bibh, Ther, Sautr

10. The Srotāpanna can regress.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś

Disagree: Ther, Sarv

11. The Srotāpanna obtains the *dhyānas*.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Vibh

Disagree: Sarv

12.The five noble faculties are worldly.

Agree: Sarv, Ther

Disagree: Mahās, Mahīś, *Śārip*, Hetuv

13. Right view is worldly.

Agree: Sarv

Disagree: Mahās, Ther, *Śārip*, Mahīś?

14. The two cessations are non-composite.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Sarv, *Śārip*, Andh

Disagree: Ther, Samm, Vātsīp

15. Space is non-composite.

Agree: Mahās?, Mahīś, Sarv, Uttar

Disagree: Ther, Samm, Vātsīp, *Śārip*

16. *Pratītyasamutpāda* is non-composite.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Vibh, *Śārip*, Dham, Pūrv

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, Samm, Vātsīp

17. *Mārga* (or *niyāma*) is non-composite.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, Vibh, Andh, Śārip

Disagree Ther, sarv, Samm, Vātsīp

18. *Tathatā* (or *dharmasthitatā)* is non-composite.

Agree: Mahīś, some Uttara, *Śārip*

Disagree: Ther, sarv, Samm, Vātsīp, Mahās

19. The four *arūpyasamāpattis* are non-composite.

Agree: Mahās, *Śārip*

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, Mahīś, Samm, Vātsīp

20. The four Fruits alone are non-composite.

Agree: Vibh, *Śārip*, Pūrv

Disagree: Ther, Sarv

21. The material of the Saint is *mārga*.

Agree: Mahās, Mahīś, *Śārip*, Samm

Disagree: Ther

22. Form can be good or bad.

Agree: Mahīś, Sarv, Samm, *Śārip*

Disagree: Ther, Mahā?, Darṣṭ?

23. Form is maturation.

Agree: *Śārip*, Andh, Samm,, Sarv

Disagree: Ther, Mahās, Darṣṭ

24. *Nirvāṇa* is good.

Agree: *Śārip*, Andh, Sarv

Disagree: Ther

25. Nirvāṇa may be *śaikṣa* or *aśaikṣa*.

Agree: *Śārip*, Vātsīp, Vibh

Disagree: Sarv., Ther

26. The mind is naturally pure.

Agree: Mahās, Vibh, *Śārip*

Disagree Sarv

27. Sound is maturation.

Agree: Mahaṣ, Vibh, *Śārip*, Vātsīp

Disagree Sarv, Ther

28. The Bodhisattva is conceived without *kāma* or *vyāpāda*.

Agree: Mahās, Vibh, Haimav

Disagree: Sarv

29. The Bodhisattva goes to *durgati*.

Agree: Mahās, Andh, Sarv, Cetiya

Disagree: Ther

30. Buddha and Śrāvaka have the same career.

Agree: Mahīś

Disagree: Dharm, Sarv, *Śārip*

31. There is *brahmacarya* among the Gods.

Agree: Dharm, Sarv, late Mahīś, Ther, Śārip

Disagree: Mahīś, Haimav, Samm

32. *Tīrthikas* obtain the five *abhijñās*.

Agree: Sarv, Vātsīp

Disagree: Mahīś, Haimav, Dharm

33. The *pṛthagjana* abandons the *kleśas*.

Agree: Samm, Sarv

Disagree: Ther, Mahīś, Dārṣṭ

34. There are six destinies (*gati*).

Agree: Andh, Uttar, Vātsīp

Disagree: Ther, *Śārip*, Sarv

35. There is form (*rūpa*) in the *ārūpyas*.

Agree: Vibh, Andh, *Śārip*, Mahās

Disagree: Ther, Sarv

36. There are five sense spheres in the *rūpadhātu*.

Agree: Mahās, Andh, Samm

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, *Śārip*

37. There is no sense sphere in the *rūpadhātu*.

Agree: Ther

Disagree: Mahās, Andh, Samm, Sarv, *Śārip*

38. There are five sense consciousnesses in the *rūpadhātu*.

Agree: Mahās

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, *Śārip*

39. There are no sense consciousnesses in the *rūpadhātu*.

Agree: Ther

Disagree: Mahās, Sarv, *Śārip*

40. There are five sense consciousnesses in the *ārūpyadhātu*.

Agree: Mahās

Disagree: Ther, Sarv, *Śarip*

41. The five sense consciousnesses are *sarāga*.

Agree: Mahās, Mahī, Sarv, *Śārip*

Disagree: Vātsīp

42. The five sense consciousnesses are *virāga*.

Agree: Mahās, Māhīś

Disagree: Vātsīp, *Śārip*, Sarv

43. The *abhisamaya* of the truths is progressive.

Agree: Andh, late Mahās, Sarv, Samm, Bhadr

Disagree: Mahās, Māhiś, Vibh, Ther <292>

Here are the relationships of the affinities established in the preceding table.[1499]

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Theravādin	38	20/13	11/14	5/8	12/17	8/18	2/12	7/8	7/11
Sarvāstivādin	20/13	41	8/19	1/15	15/17	8/22	7/9	8/8	12/6
Mahīśāsaka 1	11/14	8/19	27	10/0	13/5	19/3	6/2	3/10	6/10
Vibhajyavādin	5/8	1/15	10/0	16	10/0	13/0	5/1	3/3	1/5
Śāriputrābhidharma	12/17	15/17	13/5	10/0	31	15/6	8/2	4/10	6/11
Mahāsāṇghika 1	8/11	8/22	19/3	13/0	15/6	30	8/1	3/9	4/9
Andhaka	2/12	7/9	6/2	5/1	8/2	8/1	15	2/2	4/2
Vātsīputrīya	7/8	8/8	3/10/	3/3	4/10	3/9	2/2	16	10/0
Sammatīya	7/11	12/6	6/10	1/5	6/11	4/9	4/2	10/0	19
Dharmaguptaka	1/1	2/2	2/2	1/0	3/0	1/o	0	0/2	0/2
Pūrvaśaila	0/5	2/3	1/3	2/2	2/1	2/2	0	1/2	2/2
Dārṣṭāṇtika	3/2	1/4	5/0	2/0	3/0	3/0	2/0	1/1	1/2
Sautrāntika	3/0	1/2	3/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	1/0	0/2	0/2
Haimavata	0/2	o/4	2/1	1/0	0/1	2/0	0	0/2	1/1
Mahīśasaka 2	1/2	3/0	1/3	0/2	1/2	0/2	1/0	0	1/1
Mahāsāṇghika 2	0/2	2/0	0/2	0/2	0	0/2	1/0	1/0	2/0
Bahuśrutīya	0/1	0/1	0/1	0	0	1/0	0/1	0/1	0/1
Caitīya	0/1	0/1	0/1	0	0	1/0	0	0/1	0/1

1 = Theravādin
2 = Sarvāstivādin
3 = Mahīśāsaka 1
4 = Vibhajyavādin
5 = *Śārīputrāsbhidharma*
6 = Mahāsāṇghika
7 = Andhaka
8 = Vātsīputrīya
9 = Sammatīya

This chart throws light on some noteworthy results. In addition, nothing would have predicted some of these results.

[1499] In each relationship, the numerator indicates the number of agreements and the denominator the number of disagreements.
1 = Theravādin
2 = Sarvāstivādin
3 = Mahīśāsaka 1
4 = Vibhajyavādin
5 = *Śārīputrābhidharmika*
6 = Mahāsāṇghika 1
7 = Andhaka
8 = Vātsīputrīya
9 = Sammatīya

1) A doctrinal group including the Mahīśāsakas and the Mahāsāṇghikas (19/3), a group to which the Vibhajyavādins clearly are linked (10/0 and 13/0) and, a little less so, the *Śāriputrābhidhamaśāstra* (13/5, 15/6 and 10/1) and the Andhakas (6/2. 8/1, 6/1 and 8/2) who are the Mahāsāṇghikas of the south. We should note particularly the fact the relationship of affinities between the Vibhajyavādins and the other three sects show that there is no disgreement whatsoever among them (10/0, 13/0 and 10/0).[1500] This clearly proves that the Vibhajyavādins of the *Vibhāṣā* belong to the Mahīśāsaka-Mahāsāṇghika doctrinal group. The relationships of the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra* are also very noteworthy and indeed confirm the hypothesis of their Dharmaguptaka origin, as does also the relationship of affinities with this latter group (3/0). This treatise belongs to this group but does not have as origin either the Mahāsāghikas or the Mahīśāsakas since there are several disagreements with them. Since the hypothesis of a Kāśyapīya origin must be rejected because it denies the existence of all the past and all the future without distinction, there can hardly be any doubt that it is a work of the Dharmaguptakas, the only other sect to our knowledge that could belong to this group.

2) The doctrinal group of the Ceylonese Theravādins and the Kashmirian Sarvāstivādins. The relationship of affinities (20/13) is much less great than in the preceding case, which is explained quite naturally by the enormous geographical distance, 3 to 5 thousand km. as the crow flies, separating the areas of these two sects. But <293> their negative relationship of affinities, (8/18 and 8/22) with the Mahīśāsakas, (11/14 and 8/19) with the Mahāsāṇghikas and (12/17 and 14/18) with the *Śāriputrābhidharma* are quite comparable. These results, although still negative, differ in regard to the Andhakas (2/12 and 7/9) and the Vibhajyavādins (5/8 and 1/15) because the former are known to us solely through the Theravādins and the latter through the Sarvāstivādins and, in both cases, the sources do not reveal the affinities of these sects with their own, limiting themselves to noting the disagreements considered as heresies.

3) The very homogeneous group (10/0) of the Vātsīputrīyas and the Sammatiyas, the former being known to us almost solely through the Kashmirian sources and the latter through the Ceylonese sources. This remarkable agreement, which we expected, fully justifies the confidence we have placed in these sources. This group is characterized by almost always negative relationships with the two preceding ones, although often close to 1). This confirms that this group evolved separately, subject to somewhat similar influences coming from the other two as well as from the north and the south. Its geographical position in the west of India explains this fact.

4) Although the number of their theses examined here is too small to draw solid conclusions, here we may note the affinities of the Dārṣtāntikas and the Sautrāntikas between themselves and the sects of the first group. We may wonder whether, while separating from the Sarvāstivādins, they were not more or less

---

[1500] T. Kimura, in his *Recherches sur l'Abhidharma* (1922) had already noted that the doctrine of the *Śāriputrābhidharma* was very close to that of the Vibhajyavādins of the *Vibhāṣā* and *Abhidharmakośa*.Similarly, C. Akanuma and T. Kimura, in articles in the Japanese journal *Shûkyô Kenkyû* (vol. II, 1925, pp. 7065-726 and 839-870) link these same Vibhajyavādins doctrinally to the Mahāsāṇghika school (after Demiéville, *Origine des Sectes*, p. 57 and p. 49, note).

suibject to the influence of the Mahāsāṇghikas and the Mahīśāsakas. As for the secondary schools of these last sects, they seem to have been under the preponderant influence of the Sarvāstivādins. On the other hand, and whatewver Vasumitra says, the affinity of the Haimavatas seems to turn away from the Sarvāstivādins and is directed towards the Mahāsāṇghikas. But once again, the number of theses examined is too small to allow us, in these three cases, to draw any consclusions.

The examination of some 400 secondary theses is, by comparison, deceiving because the number of shared questions is very much reduced except, obviously, in regard to the Theravādins, the Sarvāstivādins and the sect of the *Śāriputrābhidharma* whose *Abhidharmapiṭakas* we have the good fortune to possess.

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**[1501]
Mahīṣāsaka	11	1/1	1/1	0	3/4	2/2	1/1	5/6	5/6
Mahāsāṇghika	1/1	45	2/0	3/0	2/6	0/1	0	3/28	2/20
Andhaka	1/1	2/0	57	3/2	5/3	0	5/1	0/57	10/15
Vibhajyavādin	0	3/0	3/2	25	1/5	0	0	0/7	0/25
Śāriputrābhidharma	3/4	2/6	5/3	1/5	48	2/0	2/2	32/16	32/6
Vatsīputrīya	2/2	0/1	0	0	2/0	15	1/0	1/2	4/10
Sammatīya	1/1	0	5/1	0	2/2	1/0	11	1/10	2/1
Theravādin	5/6	3/28	0/57	0/7	32/16	1/2	1/10	180	50/20
Sarvāstivādin	5/6	2/20	10/15	0/25	32/6	4/10	2/1	50/20	90

1 = Mahīśāsaka
2 = Mahāsāṇghika
3 = Andhaka
4 =Vibhajyavādin
5 = Śāriputrābhidharma
6 = Vatsīputrīya
7 = Sammatīya
8 = Theravādin
9 = Sarvāstivādin

If we take into account the very important fact that, in most cases, we know only the disagreements, considered as heresies by the various sources, and that we do not always know the agreements, we can see that it is unwise to draw consclusions from a statistical study of the secondary problems. <294>
However, there are cases where, lacking anything better, we must utilize both the lesser and the greater problems: this is the case for the small sects for which we have little information. And yet it with the greatest of reserve that we draw consclusions in examining them.

[1501] **1** = Mahiśāsaka
2 = Mahāsāṇghika
3 = Andhaka
4 = Vibhajyavādin
5 = *Śāriputrīyābhidharma*
6 = Vatsīputrīya
7 = Sammatīya
8 = Theravādin
9 = Sarvāstivādin

1. Study of the Uttarāpathakas, a composite group very poorly defined from the doctrinal poiont of view, furnishes no statistical information worthy of interpretation.

2. Study of the Dharmaguptakas reveals only somehat of an agreement (4/0) with the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, and disagreements with the Sarvāstivādins (5/8), the Mahīśāsakas (2/6), the Vātsīputrīyas (0/2) and the Sammatīyas (0/2).

3. The Haimavatas are distinguished by their agreements with the Mahāsāṇghikas (2/0) and the Mahīśāsakas (2/1) and their disagreements with the Sarvāstivādins (0/4) and the Theravādins (0/2). But we should not forget that our main informants, Vasumitra and Bhavya, contradict themselves in regard to the position of the Haimavatas in regard to the two major questions in which they were interested.

4. The Dārṣṭāntīkas are in open agreement with the Sautrāntikas (7/0), the Vibhajyavādins (6/0), the Mahīśāsakas (5/0) and the Andhakas (3/0). On the other hand, their disagreement is noteworthy with the Theravādins (5/13) and the *Śāriputrābhidharma* (4/12).[1502]

5. The agreement of the Sautrāntikas with the Darṣṭāntikas (7/0) is the only noteworthy fact in regard to the former.[1019]

6. The agreement of the late Mahīśāsakas with the Sarvāstivādins (5/0) whose fundamental thesis they adopted, and their disagreement with the Mahāsāṇgikas (0/3) and the early Mahīśāsakas (0/3) is not surprising.

7. Similarly, we may note the agreement of the late Mahāsāṇghikas with the Sarvāstivādins (2/1) and the Sammatīyas and the disagreement with the Theravādins (0/2), the Mahīśāsakas (1/3), the Vibajyavādins (o/2) and the early Mahāsāṇghikas (0/2).

8. We should note the agreement of the Prajñaptivādins and the Hetuvādins of Buddhaghosa (3/0) as well as their disagreements with the Sarvāstivādins (0/2 and 0/2) with whom some sources claim to identify the latter. Since this agreement is limited to the grand theory of suffering and since Buddhaghosa ignores the Prajñaptivādins, we may wonder if these two sects should not be identified.

9. We should note the Lokottaravādin theses of the Vetullakas in regard to the Buddha (three theses) as well as in regard to the Saṃgha (four theses), which relates them clearly to the most advanced sects of the Mahāsāṇghikas.

10. The geographical proximity of their respective territories is perhaps the only explanation for the positive relationship of the Sammatīyas with the Andhakas (8/1) and the Pūrvaśailas (4/0), but we should not forget that we know the doctrines of these three sects only from the single Ceylonese source which could not indicate the disagreements existing between them.

11. There is also an undeniable relationship among some Prajñaptivādin theses and those of the Rājagirikas and Siddhārthikas.

The examination of the relationship of affinities of the others sects does not reveal anything of note.

[1502] We can scarecely take into account the relationship of these two sects with the Sarvāstivādins (0/44 and 0/24) for we know their doctrines only through the intermediary of those who clearly mention only the disagreements.

[1019] Ibid.

As a result, only the statistical study of the relationships of affinity of the big problems is able to furnish information worthy of being considered.

Let us return to these results, the most important of which is certainly the highlighting of a doctrinal group including the Mahāsāghikas and the early Maīśāsakas, <295> the Vibhajyavādins of the *Vibhāṣā* and the writers of the *Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra*, and let us try to establish the basis for their shared doctrine.

1) The past and the future have no real existence.

This is the rejection of the Sarvāstivāda[1503] theory and compromises proposed by the Kāśyapīyas and some Mahāsāghika sects such as the Andhakas.

2) There is no intermediary existence (*antarābhava*) between death and the consecutive rebirth.

3) The latent tendencies (*anuśaya*) are dissociated from the mind (*cittaviprayukta*), without object (*anālambana*) and different from the manifestly active defilements (*paryavasthāna*) which themselves are, by contrast, associated with the mind (*cittasaṃprayukta*).

4) Complete understanding (*abhisamaya*) of the four noble Truths *(āryasatya*) takes places at a single time and not progressively.

5) Right view (*samyagdṛṣṭi*) and the five faculties (*indriya*) of faith (*śraddhā),* energy (*vīrya*), mindfulness (*smṛti*), wisdom (*prajñā)* and meditation (*samādhi*) are supramundane (*lokottara*) only and never worldly (*laukika*).

6) The Srotāpanna can regress but not the Arhant. The Srotāpanna obtains the meditations (*dhyāna*).

7) The cessation due to discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyānirodha*), the cessation without discrimination (*apratisaṃkhyānirodha*), dependent origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*), the Path (*mārga*) or the assurance of ultimate attainment of enlightenment (*niyāma*) and the higher meditations (*dhyāna*), Immobility *(āneñinjya*) or the four formless absorptions *(ārūpyasamāpatti*) are non-composite. The list of their non-composites, which is variable, consists of nine terms.

8) The form (*rūpa*) of the Saint, i.e., right speech (*samyagvāc*), right conduct (*samyakkarmānta*), right livelihood (*samyagājīva*) and right bodily effort (*samyakkāyavyāyāma*), is Path (*mārga*).

9) Mind (*citta*) is pure (*prabhāsvara*) in its original nature. It is the adventitious *(āgantuka*) impurities (*kleśa*) that soil it.

10) Sound (*śabda*) is maturation (*vipāka*).

The following theses should probably be added to this group:

1) The individual (*pudgala*) does not really exist.

2) When they are conceived, the Bodhisattvas have no lust (*kāma*) or hatred (*vihiṃsā).*

3) There is no form (*rūpa*) in the formless realm *(ārūpyadhātu*).

4) The four Fruits of the religious life (*śrāmaṇyaphala*) alone are non-composite (*asaṃskṛta*). <296>

[1503] It is on account of this that they are designated as Vibhajyavādin by the Sarvāstivādins.

Appendix III

Origins of the Mahāyāna

The problem of the origins of the Mahāyāna continues to interest both Western and Eastern researchers. Actually, it is one of the most important and also one of the most obscure in the history of Buddhism. If we set aside certain traditions and the few pieces of information that we can extract from the comparative study of documents of the Lesser and Greater Vehicles that have come down to us, no facts have been preserved for us on the passsage from Hīnayāna to Mahāyāna. On the one hand, the traditions relating to this transition are few in number, late and suspicious. On the other hand, the comparative study can be based only on the works of sects truly Hīnayānist or Mahāyānist, and on the information furnished by the *Kathāvathu*, Vasumitra, Bhavya, Vasubandhu, etc.

In view of the complexity of the problem, it is appropriate to draw up an inventory of facts on which the possibility of a solution rests today or, more or less, a hypothesis.

A) *Facts about the Canon*

1) Paramārtha, in the middle of the 6th century reports that the sects of the Mahāsāṇghika group incorporated into the Canon the *Mahāyānasūtras* and, in particular, the *Prajñāpāramitā,* the *Avataṃsaka*, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, the *Śrīmālā,* the *Vimalakīrti* and the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa,* which they cite.[1504]

2) The *Satyasiddhiśāstra* of Harivarman, rightly considered by Paramārtha as a work of the Bahuśrutīyas, is an expression of a Canon of five parts: *Sūtra-*, *Vinaya-, Abhidharma-* (of six *pādas*), *Saṃyukta-* and *Bodhisattva-piṭakas*.[1505]

3) According to Hiuan-tsang, the Mahāsāṇghika Canon also included five parts, namely: *Sūtra-, Vinaya-, Abhidharma-*, *Saṃyukta-* and *Dhāraṇī-pitakas*.[1506]

4) According to Paramārtha, the Dharmaguptakas had a Canon in four or five parts: *Sūtra-, Vinaya-, Abhidharma-*, *Bodhisattva-* and, according to one tradition, *Dhāraṇī-pitakas*. [1507]

5) The *Nandimitrāvadāna*, which Sylvain Lévi and Przyluski attribute to the Dharmaguptaka, involves a Canon of four parts composed of the *Sūtra- Vinaya- Abhidharma-* and *Bodhisattva-piṭakas*.[1508]

6) The preface of the *Ekottara-āgama* translated into Chinese at the end of the 6th century by Gautama Saṇghadeva cites a Canon in four parts consisting <297> of: *Sūtra-, Vinaya-, Abhidharma-* and *Saṃyukta-piṭakas*, the latter containing "the Sūtras that contain the meaning of the Mahāyāna, by developing it." But

[1504] Demiéville*, Les sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 20, 41 and 43.
[1505] T. S. 1646, pp. 352c, 297c and 300b.
[1506] Watters: On Yuan-Chwang's travels, II, pp. 160-161.
[1507] Demiéville: Op. cit, pp. 23 and 61-62.
[1508] T. S. 2030.

this *Ekottara-āgama*, on the evidence of some indications, is generally thought of as being of Mahāsāṇghika origin.[1509]

7) The *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra*, some of which was translated into Chinese at the end of the 2nd century, probably forms the oldest class of Mahāyānasūtras. But a tenacious tradition states that the *Prajñāpāramitā* began the *pradakṣiṇa* in India in the southern direction and this detail has not escaped from eminent Occidental and Oriental Indianists. But the interpretation of this fact is rather uncertain as Lamotte has seen.[1510] However, while refusing to see in this tradition an indication of the southern origin of the *Prajñāpāramitā,* he willingly recognizes that there is good reason to think that "the Mahāyānasūtras in general and the Prajñā in particular are derived from the South Land of Andhra)."

8) The Canon described by the author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*, who is a Mādhyamikan and possibly Nāgārjuna himself, is that of the Sarvāstivādins.[1511]

B) *Facts about the Doctrine*

1) The concept of the Buddha and the Bodhisattva among the sects of the Mahāsāṇghika group is very close to that of the Mahāyāna, as we have seen.[1512]

2) We are quite ignorant of the concept of the Buddha and the Bodhisattva among the Sautrāntikas, but the silence of the main adversary, the Sarvāstivādins, on this question is a proof that their opinion on this point scarcely differed from that of the orthodox sects of the Sthavira group and was consequently very far from that of the Mahāyāna.[1513]

3) The concept of the Buddha and Bodhisattva among the Dharmaguptakas and in the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, without being as advanced as that of the Mahāsāṇghikas and related sects, represents a first step on the path that leads to the Mahāyāna doctrine.

4) The ontology of the sects of the Mahāsāṇghika group, although appearing under different aspects, is generally close to that of the Mahāyāna.

5) It is the same for the ontology of the *Satyasiddhiśāstra* of Harivarman. It is precisely the ontological position of this work that has contributed to recognizing either a Sautrāntika or Bahuśrutīya or Prajñaptivādin origin for it.

6) The ontology of the Sautrāntika and Dārṣṭāntika, on the other hand, is much less close to the Mahāyāna than a superficial examination so far has made.

C) *Facts about the Geography*

[1509] T. S. 125.
[1510] Lamotte: *Traité*, p. 35, n. 1.
[1511] Ibid, pp. 103-112.
[1512] See above, Appendix I. Se also L. V. P., *Siddhi*, pp. 762-813.
[1513] La Vallée Poussin has acknowledged the opinion that attributed to the Sautrāntikas, alone among the Hīnayāna scholastics, a doctrine of the three bodies of Buddha identical to that of the Mahāyāna (L. V. P., *Siddhi*, p. 763). On the other hand, the Mahāsāṇfhikas seem to have maintained the theory of the three bodies, with the *nirmānkāya* (thesis 6) and the *saṃbhogakāya* (thesis 9). As for the *dharmakāya*, there is even less difficulty in attributing it to them as even the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins recognize it.

1) Nāgārjuna seems to have been born and lived for a long time in Andhra, particularly around Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Amarāvati, under the protection of a king of the Śātavāhana dynasty. Other traditions place him in relationship to Kashmir and to Nālandā in Magadha.[1514] <298>

2) Aśvaghosa is placed in relationship with Kaṇiṣka and Kashmir, but was born in the Aoudh at Sāketa.[1515]

3) Aryadeva was born in Ceylon and lived in the south of India in the land of Coḷa.[1516]

4) Harivarman was a native of central India.[1517]

5) Bhāvaviveka was born in the south of India, undoubtedly at Malayagiri, and lived for a long time in the land of Andhra at Dhanakaṭaka.[1518]

6) Buddhapālita was born in the south of India, in the land of Tambala.[1519]

7) Candrakīrti was born in the south, at Samaṇṭa.[1520]

8) Diṇnāga was born in the south, near Kāñci.[1521]

`9) Sthiramti was born in the south, at Daṇḍakārañja.[1522]

10) Dharmapala was born in the south.[1523]

11) Asaṇga and Vasubandhu were born at Puruṣapura at the border of Kashmir and spent part of their lives at Ayodhyā.[1524]

12) At the end of the 3rd century, the Vetullakas appeared in Ceylon, some of whose theses are apparently Mahāyānist, even tantric.[1525]

13) The apostles of the Vajrayāna who propagated this doctrine in China as early as 700 all came from southern or central India: Śubhakarasiṃha from Oḍra, Vajrabodhi from Malaya, Amoghavjra from Ceylon.[1526]

14) Hiuan-tsang, during his journey to India in the first half of the 7th century, met Mahāyāna adepts in the following places: Kapiśa (5,000), Lampa (a few), Palusa (50), Uḍḍiyāna (a few), Takṣaśilā (a few), Takṣaśilā region (300), Madhyadeśa (1,100), Mahāśala (a few), Śvetapura (a few), Magadha (8,000), Puṇyavardhana (700), Orissa (10,000), Kośala (10,000), Parvata (100), Varaṇa (300), region of Ghazni (10,000), Yarkhand (100), Khotan (4,000). He mentions the presence of the two Vehicles at: Jālandhara (2,000), Mathurā (2,000), Kanauj (10,000), Ayodhyā (3,000),Vṛjji (1,000), Nepal (2,000), Puṇyavardhana (3,000), Koṇkaṇapura (10,000), Mahārāṣṭra (5,000), region of Mount Abou (1,000), Ujjayana (300), Parvata (1,000) Baluchistan coast (6,000), Huoh (a few hundred). Finally, he met Mahāyāna-Sthaviras at: Bodh-Gaya (1000), Kaliṇga (500), Bharukaccha (300), Surāṣṭra (2,500) and, it seems, in Ceylon. Thus, at

---

1514 Lamotte: Traité, I, pp. X – XIV.
1515 Grousset: *Histoire de l'ExtrĪme-Orient*, p. 78.
1516 Ibid., p. 76; Watters: *On Yuan-Chwang*, II, p. 224.
1517 Hobogirin, appended Fasc., p. 142a.
1518 Watters, op. cit, II, pp. 215, 222, 224; Taranatha, p. 136.
1519 Tarantha, p. 135.
1520 Ibid, p. 147.
1521 Ibid, p. 130.
1522 Ibid, p. 129.
1523 Ibid., p. 160.
1524 Takakusu: *The Life of Vasubandhu by Paramārtha*, T'oung-pao, 1904, pp. 3-30.
1525 Cf. above, chap, XXXIV of the 22nd part.
1526 Same as footnote 11.

the beginning of the 7th century, the Mahāyāna was especially flourishing in Kapiśa, in the Ghazni region, in the Ganges basin, in Konkan, in Orissa, in Mahākośala and in Khotan, thus consisting of three nuclei, one in the north-west in the valleys of upper Kaboul and the high Hilmend (15,000), another including the entire north of Dekkhan (35,000) and the last extending over the whole Ganges basin (20,000).[1527]
The Mahāyānists were least numerous in southern India especially in Ceylon, but that in no way prejudges a more favorable earlier situation. Besides, at the time of Houan-tsang, Buddhism - Hīnayāna as well as Mahāyāna - was in a recession in the south of the peninsula.

d) *"Negative" Facts*

There remains an aspect of the question about which, it seems, so far has received no attention and which, however, is very troubling if one reflects on it. Although the works of the Greater Vehicle have never failed to cite and often criticize the opinions of the Hīnayāna, no work of the Lesser Vehicle cites and refutes theses belonging necessarily and uniquely to the Mahāyāna. Certainly it is well understood that even the word 'Mahāyāna' is absent from the canonical literature of the Lesser Vehicle, as well as that of the Theravādins and the Sarvāstivādins. The few theses of Mahāyānist aspect of the *Kathāvatthu* which Buddhaghosa attributes to the Vetullakas, for example, may well have been maintained by the 'advanced' Hīnayānists and, in any case, they have nothing specifically Mahāyānist. But at the time of Buddhaghosa, of Saṃghabhadra, the Mahāyāna had already existed for at least five centuries and had been made illustrious by Nāgārjuna, Aryadeva and many other famous thinkers. Perhaps a very careful study of the *Vibhāṣā* slowed down, among the numerous anonymous theses or theses attributed to the tīrthikas, in principle non-Buddhist, some clearly Mahāyānist ideas. But that would hardly move us forward, even from the chronological viewpoint, since the *Vibhāṣā* is later than Nāgārjuna and the latter presupposes the existence of an already important *Mahāyānasūtra*. This silence is even more strange in that the *Vibhāṣā* and other Hīnayāna doctrinal works were well acquainted with the theses of the tīrthikas of every kind, citing and frequently refuting them, as well as those of the Mahāyāna. Why this exclusion, among the Sarvāstivādins of the North-west as well as the Theravādins of Ceylon, when, of all the ideas to be combatted on the level of thought, those of the Mahāyāna were logically the most important, both as Buddhist as well as revolutionary, as those most scandalous to the orthodox, the conservatives of the Lesser Vehicle? To explain this silence, we are reduced to two hypotheses.

The works of Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra are distinctly centered on a polemic between two separate sects, the Vaibhāṣikas and the Sautrāntikas, and this is clearly proved by the fact that, except in a very small number of cases, both of these thinkers make no allusion to any other sects. Therefore it is not surprising that they do not speak of the Mahāyānists and their theses. We may note in passing, an interesting fact that confirms this point, that Saṃghabhadra briefly cites, among four or five schools, the

[1527] For these calculations it has been arbitrarily assumed that, in the regions where the two vehicles were represented, their adherents were equal in number and half of the numbers indicated by Hiuan-tsang have been used

Prajñaptivādins for whom everything present is merely designation (*prajñapti*), and the Nihilists, according to whom all things are without self-nature (*svabhāva*), a distinctively Mahāyānist opinion. Similarly, if Buddhaghosa, in his commentary on the *Kathāvatthu*, does not attribute any thesis to the Mahāyāna, it is that none of it is specifically Mahāyānist.

Such is not the case, on the contrary, for the *Vibhāṣā* which also takes on the Vibhajyavādins, the Dārṣṭāntikas, the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Mahīśāsakas, the Vātsīputrīyas, the Kāśyapīyas, the Dharmaguptakas, as well as the Tīrthikas and the Nirgranthas. This is not the case for the *Kathāvatthu* itself. But the *Vibhāṣā* and the *Kathāvatthu* were composed about the year 250 of our era <300> at the latest, whereas Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra lived in the 5th century as well as Buddhaghosa. During these two hundred years, the situation had changed a great deal. Moreover, it must be taken into consideration that the *Vibhāṣā* of Kashmir, although it knows the opinions of the sects of the north-west well, does not know those of the Andhakas and the Theravādins and that, on its side, the *Kathāvatthu* of Ceylon, knows the Sarvāstivādins very poorly, since Buddhaghosa recognized only four of their theses. As a result, the awareness of the opinions of the sects is inversely proportional to the distances separating their domain from the center where the collection of the controversies was written, whether *Vibhāṣā* of Kashmir or *Kathāvatthu* of Ceylon.

Everything then happens as if, towards the end of the 2nd century, the Mahāyāna, then in its beginning, was confined to a region distant from both Kashmir and Ceylon, and undoubtedly closer to the latter region, for certain of its influences make themselves felt among the theses denounced in the last part of the *Kathāvatthu*, whereas nothing similar transpired, as far as we can judge, among the opinions critiqued in the *Vibhāṣā*.[1528] If this is so, the sphere of the Mahāyāna at this time was not to be found in a region often frequented by pilgrims, like Magadha. We must think then of the region of Konkan, of Orissa, and Mahākośala, situated between the land of Andhra and the Ganges valley, and where, in the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang noted the presence of the most important Mahāyānist center of India. It is a relatively wild area, situated far from the great centers of civilization as well as the major routes frequented by the pilgrims.

This hypothesis, however, has a grave difficulty, If the Mahāyāna was confined in the India of the 2nd century to the region north of the Plateau of the Dekkhan, how can we explain that the first Chinese translations of the *Mahāyānasūtra* had already been made in the second half of the same century by the Parthian, Sogdian and Khotanese monks. Therefore there existed, in the middle of the 2nd century outside India and on its north-west boundaries, a Mahāyānist community. Now the only route by which the Indian missionaries came to convert these distant regions to the Mahāyāna crosses the fief of the Sarvāstivādin Vaibhāṣikas, the north-west of India. It is not very likely that at first these missionaries, assuredly zealous, would have crossed this region where Buddhism was already flourishing thanks to the protection of the

[1528] If we come across Mahāyānist theses critiqued in the Vibhāsā, it can be only among the anonymous theses and, contrary to the usage of its authors, this anonymity will be proof that the latter did not know the name of their partisans and consequently that they were very little known in the North-west of India.

Kouchānese kings, without having been noticed, without their passage and especially their doctrines, so heterodox to Sarvāstivādin eyes, drawing attention to those they thought necessary to discuss and refute in the *Vibhāṣā*. Perhaps they were so few and their passage so quick that the event remained purely local and quickly forgotten in the Sarvāstivādin territory whereas, outside India, their mission found a virgin ground propitious to rapid development. Perhaps also, at that distant time, the Mahāyāna emissaries who crossed northwest India still bore the well-known names of Sarvāstivādin Mahāsāṇghika or even Vibhajyavādin, and the *Mahāyānasūtras* which they were carrying and teaching were part of the *Saṃyuktapiṭaka* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* of the Canon of these sects then in full doctrinal evolution.

We are able to formulate a hypothesis according to which the land or origin of the Mahāyāna was the region included between the Godaverī and the <301> Ganges, i.e., Konkan, Mahākośala and Orissa. The Buddhist communities of this land received two streams of influence, one coming from the north, from Magadha, sacred land of Buddhism where all the sects mingled in pilgrimage, and the other coming from the south, from the land of Andhra where, before our era, a group of sects had become installed and developed, a group lately come from the Mahāsāṇgika. As we have seen, the tradtitions about the Canon, although relatively late, are formal and in agreement on a twofold point. On one side, the Canon of the sects of the Mahāsāṇghika group or those influenced by them has more than three Baskets, notably a *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*[1529] which shows a clearly pre-Mahāyānist leaning to the special cult of the Bodhisattva, and a *Saṃyuktapiṭaka* of which one source at least explains formally the Mahāyānist tendency. On the other side, the sects of the Mahāsāṇghika group had incorporated into their Canon the main Sūtras of the Mahāyāna. One single difficulty presents itself: the recognition of the *Tripiṭaka* of the Sarvāstivādins as the orthodox Canon by a Mādhyamika master who may well have been Nāgārjuna himself.

The traditions regarding the geographical origin are likewise formal: all the great masters of the Mādhyamika school, the oldest of those of the Mahāyāna, were native to southern or central India and, moreover, the Vajrayāna missionaries later set out from Ceylon and the far south of India to go to China.

But those are traditions difficult or impossible to monitor, which have only the merit of their convergence and even of their existence. Much more serious, on the other hand, are the doctrinal facts.

According to the very definition given to it, the Mahāyāna is above all a buddhological doctrine that is characterized by the importance given to the career and nature of the Bodhisattva and the Buddhas considered as supramundane, marvelous, and by the depreciation of the nature and career of the Arhant.

And yet it is a fact that the Hīnayāna sects that are distinguished by a doctrine making the Buddha and the Bodhisattva transcendent and supernatural beings while considering with scorn the nature and career of the Arhant, all belong to the Mahāsāṇghika group. A few of these theses are likewise attributed by Buddhaghosa to the Vetullakas and by the *Vibhāsā* to the Vibhajyavādins. This last fact is extremely important because neither the *Vibhāṣā* nor Vasubandhu nor Sāṃghabhadra attribute any thesis of buddhology, not only of pro-Mahāyānist tendency but even any thesis whatsoever of buddhology, to the

[1529] The only work known under this title, T.S. 316, is a Mahāyānist sūtra of the *Mahāratnakūta* class.

Sautrāntikas or the Dārṣṭāntikas. On the contrary, the latter maintain a thesis exalting the nature of the Arhant, namely, that the form of his body is pure (*anāsrava*). It is evident that if the Sautrāntikas or the Darṣṭāntikas had defended theses of buddhology of Lokottaravādin or of Mahāyānist tendency, as did the Vibhajyavādins and the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Sarvāstivādins, notably the authors of the Vibhāsā and Vasubandhu or Saṃghabhadra would have been very happy to seize these supplementary opportunities to nail them to the pillory. Their complete silence on this point is a clear proof that the doctrine of the Buddha and the Bodhisattva among the Sautrāntikas and the Dārṣṭāntikas was identical with that of the Sarvāstivādins, which certainly had nothing Mahāyānist or even Lokottaravādin about it. This point is well established. <302>

On the other hand, in the buddhology of the Mahāsāṇghikas and related sects, there are traits that reveal an undeniable affinity with the Mahāyāna. Thus, in more than the *dharmakāya*, known by all the sects, as it seems, the Mahāṇghikas recognize the existence of the *nirmāṇakāya* (thesis 6) and the *saṃbhogakāya* (thesis 9). The life of the Buddha is eternal and, in order to convert beings, he does not enter nirvāṇa (thesis 9).

The question of ontology is much more discussed. In the eyes of some western scholars, the Sautrāntikas seem to have maintained that things are not substances (*dravya*) but simple denominations (*prajñapti*).[1530] I [Bareau] confess that on my part I have never come across, apparently no more than La Vallée Poussin did, who knows them so well,[1531] any such thesis attributed to the Sautrāntikas. I have the impression that this idea was born from a bad interpretation and an oversimplified generalization of a group of theses effectively defended by the Sautrāntikas and Darṣṭāntikas.[1532] If both of them say that the two cessations and empty geometric space have no real existence, no more than do the past and the future, dreams, objects created by magic, sound, images reflected in water or in a mirror, degeneration, the characteristics of composites, phrases, phonemes, touch, the objects of the passions, the vital faculty, shape, non-information, attainments and non-attainments, the nature of the secular, and even causes and conditions, that is not surprising. Reacting against the extreme realism of the Sarvāstivādins, they refuse to consider as existent things that simple common sense and experience reveal to them as being pure phenomena or modalities without concrete existence. Their argument demonstrates it well, besides, which recalls the rough common sense of the most orthodox, the most archaistic sect of the Lesser Vehicle, the Theravādins, in whom nobody would expect to find the origin of the Mahāyāna. Besides, like the Sautrāntikas, the Theravādins and the Mahīśāsakas refuse to recognize the existence of the past and the future. The interest would have

[1530] For example, Glasenapp: *La philosophie indienne*, p. 262.
[1531] See the index and the part of the introduction of the *Kośa* dedicated to he Sautrāntikas and Sārṣṭāntikas.
[1532] After much research, it seems to me {Bareau] that the origin of the opinion according to which the ontology of the Mahāyāna took birth among the Sautrāntikas should be looked for in the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* of Mādhava, a Hindu author of the end of the 14th century. This late date, very late indeed, should be taken very cautiously. The evidence of Mādhava is even more suspect to our eyes in that he knows only two sects of the Hīnayāna, the Vaibhāṣika and the Sautrāntika. This says a lot about the confidence that one should attribute to such a source.

been quite different if the Sautrāntikas had maintained that things as 'real', as concrete as matter, mind, etc. were merely denominations. But such is not the case, and the silence of the *Vibhāṣā,* of Vasubandhu and Saṃghabhadra on this point is definite proof that the Sautrāntikas and Darṣṭāntikas did not think so. If it had been otherwise, we could be assured that their opponents would not have missed attacking them with great violence on this point.

The Instantaneism of the Sautrāntikas is also invoked as proof of their Mahāyānistic tendencies. This is to forget that the same doctrine was defended by the Mahīśāsakas, the Vātsīputriyas, the Kāśyapīyas and even by the Sarvāstivādins, all sects that do not quite pass as pro-Mahāyānist. It may be argued that they refused to consider duration as one of the characteristics of the composites. Of course; but the Theravādins and the Mahīśāsakas did the same.

Someone may say that the Sautrāntikas marked a turning point in Buddhist thought in that they submitted the pan-realism of the Sarvāstivādins to tight criticism. This is to forget that long before, perhaps even centuries before <303> their appearance and as soon as the arising of the Sarvāstivādins, the latter bumped up against the vigorous and critical opposition of the Vibhajyavādins, the Theravādins, the Mahīśāsakas and then the Kāśyapīyas.

In summary, the study of the doctrine of the Sautrāntikas and the Darṣṭāntikas reveals no clearly Mahāyāna tendency, and the only points where one may claim to find it being also defended by other very Hīnayānistic sects such as the Theravādins, the Mahīśāsakas, the Vatsīputrīyas, etc., sects, to whom at least an equal part must be attributed in the formation of the Mahāyāna, and this the more so as they are older by one, two or three centuries. The theses of the origin of the Mahāyāna rests on the dangerous illusion that the Sarvāstivādins were the entire Hīnayāna or, more or less, that they constituted the most important and oldest part. This is to lend a very indulgent ear to the insinuations of Vasumitra and other Sarvāstivādin authors and to set but little value on all the other sources.

That being so, the problem that arises now may be formulated in the following terms: Among the doctrines of the sects of the Lesser Vehicle, do ontological theses showing clearly Mahāyānist tendencies exist? One can give an affirmative answer to this in all certainty. In all certainty, by reason of the diversity and agreement of sources external to the sects in question, in all certainty also because we possess an undisputable witness, a text, the *Satyasiddhiśāstra*, by Harivarman. The sects in question all belong to the Mahāsāṇgika group.

First, there is this thesis of the Andhakas according to which all things, past, future, present, matter, mind, etc., both exist and do not exist at the same time and which, although closer to ordinary common sense, still has a somewhat Mahāyānist aspect although paradoxical aspect. There are these theses of the Andhakas according to which the stability of things, impermanence, old age and death are achieved realities. There are the ontological theses of the Ekavyāvahārikas, the Lokottaravādins and the Bahuśrutīyas, which unfortunately are known to us only by one single rather late source, Paramārtha. According to the first ones, everything is merely designation (*prajñapti*). According to the second ones, mundane things, which

include the most concrete realities, such as matter, mind, sensation, etc., are fictive, whereas supramundane things only, which are all abstractions, exist. Moreover, the Lokottaravādins teach the emptiness of things like the Mahāyāna. Although one may have no doubt about the truth of Buddhaghosa's statements on the Andhakas, it is, however, permissible to have reserve in regard to those of Paramārtha on the Ekavyāvahārikas and the Lokottaravādins. Moreover, the opinions attributed to them are so close to those of the Prajñaptivādins and the *Satyasiddhiśāstra* that any doubt is definitely weakened.

The Prajñaptivādins distinguished the absolute truth and the contingent truth like Harivarman and, like him also, they declared that everything is merely designation (*prajñapti*). Paramārtha, Vasumitra, Bhavya, and even Saṃghabhadra, are in agreement on this point. Kouei-ki tells us in addition that the Prajñaptivādins were distinguished from the Ekavyāvahārikas and the Lokottaravādins in that they maintained that things are both fictive and real at the same time. This last opinion is curiously close to that of the Andhakas cited above, according to which things exist and do not exist at the same time. Moreover, for the Prajñaptivadins as for the Hetuvādins and some Uttarāpathakas, suffering is a complete and distinct reality, but the <304>

aggregates, the domains, the elements, or the faculties are not. For them the most concrete things, the most tangible things, do not constitute things in themselves, whereas some abstractions, on the other hand, do so. This is exactly the reverse of what the Theravādins think and also everything moves us to believe, the Sautrāntikas, as we have seen. But this reversal of ontological values, as we find especially in the Prajñaptivadins and the Hetuvādins, has a clearly Mahāyānist nature in its paradoxical aspect. This leaps out before the eyes if one rereads the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* and if one rereads Nāgārjuna.

But were not these Prajñaptivādins exactly the Sautrāntikas who thus bore two names? That is contrary to all the early and even late facts. Actually, all the early traditions on the genealogy of the sects clearly distinguish the Prajñaptivādins who are always counted among the Mahāsāṇghikas at the side of these same Bahuśrutīyas to whom Paramārtha attributes the Satyasiddhiśāstra, and the Sautrāntikas or Saṃkrāntivmadins, always included in the Sthavira group and, almost always, as a sect coming from the Sarvāstivādins. Besides, how could the Prajñaptivādins, who so often passed as born from the Gokulikas who, of all the Canon, retained only the Abhidharma, be identified with the Sautrāntikas who themselves categorically rejected the Abhidharma and kept only the Sūtras, whence their name? Why then did Saṃghabhadra and Vasuvarman, who knew the Sautrāntikas so well, distinguish them from the Prajñaptivādins to whom they attribute, the first, the fundamental thesis and eponym of *prajñaptivāda*, and the second, the Bahuśrutīya thesis of the three truths of suffering, ordinary and noble?[1533] For the first as for the second of these two Sarvāstivādin masters, it is evident that the Prajñaptivādins were distinct from the Sautrāntikas and, for Vasuvarman at least, it is clear that they are related to the Bahuśrutīyas with whom he seems to confuse them.

As Sylvain Lévi has it, the origin of the Mahāyāna must be sought among the Mahāsāṇghika group and, perhaps most particularly among the Prajñaptivādins and Bahuśrutīyas who form a sub-group transitional

[1533] T. S. 1563, p. 901 bc; T. S. 1562, p. 630c; T. S. 1647, p. 380a.

between the early Mahāsāṇghikas and the late Mahāsāṇghikas, between those of the north, of the Indo-Gangetic region, and those of the south, of the land of Andhra. As a matter of fact, two individual inscriptions concerning the Bahuśrutīyas have been found, one at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and the other near Peshawar, which seems to attest to the rôle of agent of contact between the two main Mahāsāṇghika centers. The great Mahāyāna center of the 7th century situated in the north of Dekkhan is located exactly between these, formerly Mahāsāṇghika, of Andhra and the Indo-Gangetic basin.

During their voyages to the Indies in the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang and I-tsing noted the presence of the Mahāsāṇghika almost nowhere and, except for Bamīyān, remaining the large Lokottaravādin center, the numbers given are insignificant compared especially to those of the Sammitīyas, the Sarvāstivādins and the Sthaviras. By contrast, Hiuan-tsang notes the presence of numerous Mahāyānists, notably in the north-west, at Kāpiśa and in the region of Ghazni and in the entire north part of the Dekkhan, at Konkan, at Mahākośala and in Orissa, i.e., in the regions or border areas where the Mahāsāṇghikas used to live. To explain both this disappearance of the Mahāsāṇghikas and this arising, apparently spontaneous, of the Mahāyānists, we may be permitted to assume that the Mahāsāṇghikas had passed little by little from the Hīnyāna to the Mahāyāna.

It seems that we can interpret similarly the mysterious <305> disappearance of the Vibhajyavādins (Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka) whose doctrines were, we have seen, closely related to those of the Mahāsāṇghikas and which it is possible to follow in their evolution towards the Mahāyāna. The following table is thus obtained:

In the 2nd cent. Sthav. Sarv. Samm. Vibh, Mahās. Unknown

In the 7th cent. Sthav. Sarv. Samm. Disappeared Mahāyāna

As we have seen, it is the silence of the Kashmirian *Vibhāṣā* and the Ceylonese *Kathāvatthu* regarding the doctrines of the Mahāyāna that encourage us to place the early home the latter far from the centers where the Sarvāstivādins and the Theravādin lived, i.e., the extreme north-west and Ceylon, and also the regions where pilgrimages obliged them to frequent, i.e., the mid-Ganges basin from Kapilavastu in the north to Bodh-Gaya in the south, and from Mathurā in the west to Nālanda in the east. The indication given by Hiuan-tsang concerning the presence of a very important Mahāyānist center in the northen part of the Dekkhan, between Godavarī and Ganges, although late, allows us to assume that this region, where the Mahāyāna was so flourishing in the 7th century, may have been its cradle. This region is surrounded by old Mahāsāṇghika centers, revealed by inscriptions from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, such as Mathurā, Amarāvati, Nāgārjunikoṇḍa or by the stories of travel by Fa-hien at the beginning of the 5th century, like Pāṭaliputra, where the Chinese monk collected several Mahāsāṇghika works in a Mahāyāna monastery. At the end of the 7th century, when the Mahāsāṇghikas were in complete decadence, it was in these same regions, Lāṭa, Sindhu, Magadha, Bengal and Andhra, that I-tsing encountered their last communities. Consequently, the

southern part of the Dekkhan plateau was at all times subjected in all parts to Mahāsāṇghika influences coming from various centers spread around it. Thus it is probable that it soon gave in to these influences and became another Mahāsāṇghika center before passing into the Mahāyāna by a process of evolution of its own.

Does this mean that other regions and other sects have not played a rôle in the formation of the Mahāyāna? It would certainly be imprudent to claim that, but it seems that their influence was secondary and later. Thus, the north-west, the middle basin of the Ganges and the south of Dekkhan, probably constituted , in the 3rd century of our era or even the end of the 1st century, some active Mahāyāna centers, certainly by reason of the presence of important Mahāsāṇghika communities in these regions. It is also very likely that certain sects of Sthavira origin, such as the Dharmagupatakas, the Haimavatas and even the Mahīśāsakas may have soon turned towards the Mahāyāna, by reason of the strong Mahāsāṇghika influences that they had earlier undergone.[1534] The theory of Przyluski according to which certain sects were split each into two schools, one Hīnayānist and the other Mahāyānist, is not only very plausible in itself but confirmed by some documents such as the account of Hiuan-tsang on the Mahāyanic Syncretism of the sects of Uddiyāṇa at the beginning of the 7th century. But those are probably just secondary movements due to the missionary activity of Mahāyāna monks come from their original homes. <306>

[1534] We may think of the affinities of the Vibhajyavādins, Dharmaguptakas, Mahīśāsakas, etc., with the Mahāsāṇgjikas.

CONCLUSION

One of the goals of this book was to present the Hīnayāna sects in their natural balance as far as our documents allow. Up to now, there has been too much tendency to judge the Lesser Vehicle entirely according to the Theravādins alone or the Sarvāstivādins alone or these two sects together, without being able to utilize readily the facts about the other schools. However, it was known that some among them, such as the Mahāsāṇghikas, the Mahīśāsakas and the Sammitīyas had played as important a rôle in the development of Buddhism as the Theravādins and Sarvāstivādins, but it was thought necessary to neglect them by reason of the *a priori* nature of the information about them. The result was a serious error in perspective which risked giving rise in turn to multiple errors in judgment on the history of Buddhist thought. It would be futile and badly timed to criticize this skepticism for, where science is concerned and more particularly in regard to the history of spiritual movements in India, "Prudence is the mother of certainty".

The overall study which we have just made shows us that this skepticism was fortunately somewhat unfair and in many cases, especially in regard to the more important problems, the cross-checking of the data given by very different sources shows the precision of our information. The contradictions which we might have expected, seeing the diversity of our documents, proved to be not very numerous. Again, in many cases, an easy critique allows the truth to be established or shows that only apparent contradictions are involved, the different schools of a given sect having been able to maintain very different propositions.

In order to appreciate the value of our information, it is appropriate to classify them under three headings: history, literature and doctrine. .

In regard to history, it is quite evident that we know very few things, let alone that we know anything. But we know hardly anything more about the history of the Sarvāstivādins than about any other sect. The Theravādins alone are better known thanks to the Ceylonese Chronicles. When we think that we do not even agree in placing Vasubandhu in the 4^{th} or the 5^{th} centuries, it would be futile to go on and on in our ignorance of the exact circumstance of the schism of Mahādeva.

In the realm of literature, we can say that, outside the works that have come down to us, we know practically nothing.

Fortunately, the case is quite different in regard to the doctrines. First of all, our information is much more plentiful since it bears upon almost five hundred different discussions, most of which are accompanied by a commentary. The critical study of these facts has proved to us that, in many cases, the correctness and precision of the attributions is very satisfactory, <307> so satisfactory that we have scarcely any reason to suspect them in the other cases. Undoubtedly customary prudence obliges us not to consider all these data as absolutely certain, but their degree of probability makes them at least useful in their quasi-totality. Consequently, from their group we can bring out the spiritual and intellectual face of the various sects and

especially the most important of these. Thanks to them, we can also sketch very reliable solutions for some problems important in the history of Buddhist thought.

But it is another aspect of the question by which these documents acquire both an absolute certainty and a much greater reach. Actually, almost all of our sources concerning the doctrines, the only ones that count here, are earlier than the 4th century of our era and most are even earlier. All the ideas that have been mentioned, even if the attributions are erroneous, were conceived in India in the very first centuries of our era, sometimes even before. A certain number of problems that they are supposed to resolve are not particular to Buddhism or to India, but are of interest to universal thought in its twofold aspect of philosophy and religion. No matter whether it was the Vibhajyavādins or the Dārṣṭāntikas who had the idea of absolute time, no matter whether it was the Vātsīputrīyas who maintained the existence of the individual, no matter whether it was the Lokottaravādins who made the Buddha into a transcendent being rather than the Sarvāstivādins or the Dharmaguptakas. The fact that counts here is that the ideas came from India, that they were born without external influences, by an intellectual evolution or a specifically Indian spiritual evolution, before the 4th century of our era.[1535]

Better yet, the abundance of data and facts added by the commentaries allows us in many cases to understand the curve of its evolution by basing ourselves on the various stages of a single theory, and that is very important for the history of the ideas. Without a doubt, many elements are lacking and we will always lack them but, it seems, the most important ones have been handed down to us and we could, we must, use them. From this point of view, we have many reasons to rejoice in the wealth of documents instead of deploring the unknown and irreparable losses that have occurred.

Thanks to all these facts, we are able to retrace not only its major outlines but also many smaller ones, of the history of Hīnayāna thought between the middle of the 4th century B.C.E. and the beginning of the 6th century C.E., that is, during the eight or nine centuries when it was especially brilliant. It was brilliant then, indeed, this mind of the Lesser Vehicle, which made a path for itself in so many different realms, tackled all the great problems posed since Antiquity for the universal mind, and attempted to resolve them in so many different ways. It extended to everything, to the limits, in time and space, of a Universe that it conceived to the extent of its imagination thirsty for immensity, and that it peopled with myriads of mythical beings, fruits of a refined poesy. Undoubtedly, sometimes it brought to these an interest not without naiveté and a desire to determine how they lived, what they thought, how they acted, what delights charmed their rarified senses. But apart from these puerilities which have their <308> charm and are not peculiar to India and Buddhism, the scholars of the Lesser Vehicle tackled serious problems of psychology, morality, mysticism and metaphysics and proposed solutions for them greatly demonstrating the depth and originality of their inventors. Sometimes even, their mind, traveling the length of routes appropriate to

[1535] Moreover, only the theses provided with a precise attribution have been used in this work. There are dozens, hundreds, of others in the Vibhāsā and elsewhere that could have brought us precious information from this point of view.

them, elaborated theories strangely resembling some doctrines that have appeared in the West fifteen or twenty centuries later, only by very different reasonings.

This brilliance of the mind of the Buddhist Lesser Vehicle of the 4th century B.C.E. to the 6th century C.E. poses another problem. What rôle did it actually play in the development of the philosophical and religious non-Budhist thought of India, that of Brahmanism, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, Nyaya, Vedānta? Actually, it is precisely at the moment when the Hīnayāna is at its apogee, in the 2nd century B.C.E., that the Mahāyāna and the other systems of Indian thought came out of the shadows and appeared, fully armed with philosophies traces of which have been sought, always in vain up until now, in the preceding centuries.[1536] Some of them, Sāṃkhya and Yoga in particular, had witnessed their existence centuries indeed previously, at the very dawn of Buddhism, but as a very faint and uncertain light, well hidden by the shadows of many centuries, these centuries during which, on the other hand, the Buddhist Lesser Vehicle shone with its brighter light. It is very possible that that is only a whim of history and that later, again many new documents will show that all these systems of thought equally followed their own lines of evolution without being much influenced by the Hīnayāna. It is very possible, but it was perhaps not entirely useless to ask the question. <309>

[1536] The history of Jain thought alone at this epoch is rather well known for reasons similar to those that make the history of Buddhist thought known to us. See Guerinot: *La religion djaina*, Paris, 1926, mainly pp. 42-68 and especially pp. 46-52.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akanuma: *The comparative catalogue of Chinese Agamas and Pāli Nikāyas,* Nagoya, 1929.

A.S.W.I.: *Archeological Survey of West India, Annual Reports*. London, from 1880.

Bagchi: *Le Canon bouddhique en Chine*, 2 vol. (Sino-Indica. No. I and IV), Paris, 1927 and 1938.

Bagchi: *On the original Buddhism, its Canon and language*, Sino-Indian Studies, II, 3-4, 1946-7.

Bapat: *Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga*, Poona, 1937.

Bareau: *Les origines du Śariputrābhidharmaśāstra*, Museon, vol. LXIII, 1-2, pp. 69-95, Louvain, 1950.

Bareau: *L'absolu en philosophie bouddhique: evolution de la notion d'asaṃskṛta*, Paris, 1951.

Bareau: *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule et leurs Abhidharmapiṭaka*, B.E.F.E.O., 50th anniversary volume of the E.F.E.O., Paris, 1952, pp. 1-11.

Bareau: *Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques dus à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinītadeva*, J.A. Paris, 1-2.

Barth: *Œuvres*, 5 vol., Paris, 1914.

Bhavya: cf. Walleser, Teramoto and Hiramatsu, and Bareau.

Buddhaghosa: *Kathāvatthu-Aṭṭhakathā,* Siamese ed. by Tissadatta Rājasudhi, Bangkok. 2465 E.N.

Chavannes: *Mémoire sur les religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la Loi dans les pays d'Occident , par I-tsing*, Paris, 1894.

Chavannes: *Voyage de Song-Yun dans l'Udyāna et le Gandhāra*, B.E.F.E.O., 1903, 3, pp. 1-63.

Chavannes: *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois*, 4 vols., Paris 1910-1911.

Cordier: *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 2 vols., Paris, 1909-1915.

Cunnungham: *The ancient geography of India*, London, 1871, and Calcutta, 1924.

Demiéville: *L'origine des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha* (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. I), Brussels, 1932, pp. 15-64.

Demiéville: *Les versions chinois du Milindapañha*, B.E.F.E.O., vol. XXIV, 1924, pp. 1-264.

Dīpavaṃsa: edited by Oldenberg, London, 1879.

Dutt: *Early monastic Buddhism*, 2 vol., Calcutta, 1941 and 1945.

Dutt: *Early history of the spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist schools*, Calcutta, 1925.

Eliot: *Hinduism and Buddhism*, 3 vol., London, 1921.

Eliot: *Japanese Buddhism*, London, 1935.

Finot: *La légende de Buddhaghosa* (Mélanges published for the 50th anniversary of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes), Paris, 1921.

Glasenapp (Von): *La philosophie indienne*, French translation by Mlle. Asnoul, Paris, 1951.

Gokhale: *The text of the Abhidharmakośakārikā of Vasubandhu*, Jour. of the Bombay Branch, Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 21, 1946, pp.73-102.

Grousset: *Sur les traces du Buddha*, Paris, 1929.

Grousset: *Histoire de l'ExtrĪme-Orient*, 2 vol. Paris, 1929.

Grousset: *L'Asie orientale, des origines au XV siècle* (Histoire générale G. Glottz, Moyen-Age, vol. X), Paris 1941.

Hôbôgirin: Additional fascicle: charts of the *Taishô Issaikyô*, published under the direction of S. Lévi and J. Takakusu, Tokyo, 1931.

Hofinger: *Etude sur le concile de Vaiśālī* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. XX), Louvain, 1946.

Hiuan-tsang: see Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels in India*.

I-tsing: see Takakusu: *A record of the Buddhist religion*.

Johnston: *Acts of the Buddha*, English transl. of the *Buddhacarita* (Panjab Univ. Publications, no. XXXII), Calcutta, 1936.

Julien: *Listes diverses des dix-huit écoles schismatiques qui sont sorties du Bouddhisme*, J. A., vol. XIV, 1859, pp. 327-361.

Kathāvatthu, Siamese ed. by Kittisāra, Bangkok, 2469 E.N.

Kathāvatthu, ed. by A.C. Taylor, 2 vol. (P.T.S), London, 1894, 1897.

Kathāvathu-Aṭṭhākathā: see Buddhaghosa.

Kern: *Le Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*, French transl. by Huet, 2 vol., Paris, 1901-1903.

K'ouei-ki: see Oyama.

Lamotte: *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, vol. I (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. XVIII), Louvain, 1944.

La Vallée Poussin (de): *L'Inde au temps des Maurya* (Histoire du Monde. L. Cavaignac, vol. VI, 1), Paris, 1930.

La Vallée Poussin (de): *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, 6 vol., Paris-Louvain, 1923-1931.

La Vallée Poussin (de): *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, 2 vol. (Buddhica. Mémoires no. I), Paris, 1928-1929.

La Vallé Poussin (de): *Bouddhisme. Etudes et matériaux*, London, 1928.

Law: *A history of Pāli literature*, 2 vol. London, 1933.

Law: *Geography of early Buddhism*, London, 1932.

Legge: *A record of the buddhistic kingdoms*, Oxford, 1896.

Lévi and Chavannes: *Les treize Arhats protecteurs de la Loi*, J. A., July-Aug. and Sept.-Oct., 1916.

Lin Li-Kouang: *Introduction au Compendium de la Loi*, Paris, 1949.

L. V. P.: see La Vallée Poussin (de).

Mahāvaṃsa: ed by Geiger (P.T.S), London, 1908.

Mahāvaṃsa: English transl. (P.T.S), London, 1912 (the pages indicated are those of the English transl.).

Mahāvastu: ed. by Senart, 3 vol., Paris, 1882-1897.

Masuda: *Origin and doctrines of early Indian buddhist schools ... of Vasumitra's treatise*, (Asia Major, vol. II, fasc. 2) 1925, pp. 1-78.

Oyama: *Yi pou tsong louen chou ki fa jen*, Kyoto, 1891.

Przyluski: *La légende de l'empereur Aśoka dans les textes indiens et chinois* (Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'études, vol. XXXII), Paris, 1923.

Przyluski: *Le concile de Rājagṛha*, (Buddhica, Mémoires, vol. II). Paris, 1926-1928.

Regamey: *Buddhistische Philosophie*, Bibliographische Einführungen in das Studium der Philosophie, Bern. 1950.

Renou and Filliozat: *L'Inde classique*, vol. I, Paris, 1949.

Rockhill: *The life of the Buddha*, London, 1884.

Schiefner: *Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*, St. Petersburg, 1869.

Taishô Issaikyô: Japanese edition of the Chinese Buddhist Canon, Tokyo, 1924-1929.

Takakusu: *A record of the buddhist religion*, Oxford, 1896.

Tāranātha: see Schiefner.

Teramoto and Hiramatsu: *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*, etc., Kyoto, 1935.

Thomas: *The history of buddhist thought*, London, 1933, 2nd ed., 1951.

Vasumitra: see Masuda, Walleser, Oyama, Teramoto and Hiramatsu, and Bareau.

Vinītadeva: see Teramoto and Hiramatsu, and Bareau.

Walleser: *Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus*, Heidelberg, 1927.

Watters: *On Yuan-chwang's travels in India*, 2 vol. London, 1904.

Winternitz: *A history of Indian literature*, vol. II, English transl. by Ketkar and Kohn, Calcutta, 1933.

ABBREVIATIONS

E.N.: Era of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa (ca. 480 A.C.)

B.C.E.: Before Christ

C.E.: After Christ

B.E.F.E.O.: Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'ExtrĪme-Orient

E.N.: Tibetan ed. of Narthang.

E.P.: Tibetan ed. of Peking

Ep. Ind.: *Epigraphia Indica*, from 1892.

J. A.: *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, from 1822.

P.T.S.: Pāli Text Society ed., London.

T. : Taishô Issaikyô ed.